

**Statement by Mr. Speaker re :
Questions given notice of for the
Session.**

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಒಟ್ಟು 196 ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳು ಬಂದಿದ್ದವು. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ 148 ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಉತ್ತರಗಳು ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಇವುಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ 135ಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರಗಳನ್ನು ಮುದ್ರಣ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಇನ್ನು 13ನ್ನು ಮುದ್ರಣ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಇನ್ನೊತ್ತಿನ ನಡವಳಿಕೆಗಳ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮುದ್ರಣ ಮಾಡಿಸಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ.....

ಜನಾಬ್. ಜೆ. ಮಹಮದ್ ಇಮಾಂರವರು.—ನಾನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಲೇ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಜಾಗೃತ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಉತ್ತರಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಬೇಕು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಹನ್ನೊಂದು ಅಲ್ಪಕಾಲಾವಧಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳು ಬಂದಿದ್ದವು; ಅವುಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ 8ನ್ನು admit ಮಾಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಒಪ್ಪಿದರು. ಆ ಪೈಕಿ 2ಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರಗಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಬಂದಿವೆ.

RESOLUTIONS.

Resolution No. 15.—(concl'd.)

**Enforcement of universal compulsory
education throughout the State.**

Mr. SPEAKER (Sri V. Venkatappa).—Sri Channabasappa will now speak on Resolution No. 15.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Shimoga District—General).—Sir, I raise a point of order regarding this resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Which resolution?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—The resolution tabled by Sri Hutehe Gowda.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Chitaldrug District—General).—The resolution which was being discussed yesterday.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Yes, Yesterday's resolution. Sir, Sri Hutehe Gowda had tabled a cut motion under Demands for Grants which was identical with the matter raised by him now in the present resolution. Standing Order No. 23 lays down that "a motion must not raise a question substantially identical with one on which the Assembly has given a decision in the same session."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Assembly has not given a decision.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—That cut motion was discussed in the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There was no decision. Sri Channabasappa will now proceed.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪನವರು (ಮೈಸೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ).—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡರು ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ತಂದು ಇನ್ನು ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯು ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಯ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅನೇಕ ವೇಳೆ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಸಹಿಯನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಲು ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಪ್ರತಿಬಂಧಕಗಳಿವೆ ಎಂದುದನ್ನೂ ಆಗಿಂದಾಗ್ಗೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಮೂಲ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಎರಡು ಮಕ್ಕಳೂ ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದೇ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಯಾವಾಗ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದು ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯೇ ಮೊದಲಾದ ಸಾಧನ ಸಂಪತ್ತುಗಳನ್ನವಲಂಬಿಸಿದೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ವಿದ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದಷ್ಟೂ ಪ್ರಸಾರ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಲ್ಲರನ್ನೂ ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ತೀವ್ರಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವುಳ್ಳವರಾಗಿ ಹಿಂದೆ ಈ ಬಾಬಿಗಾಗಿ ಬಡ್ತಿ ಟ್ಟಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು 50 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಇದ್ದುದನ್ನು ಈಗ ಸುಮಾರು ಮೂರು ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳವರೆಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾಯೋಗಿಕವಾಗಿ ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಸಹ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಅನುಭವಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದರಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ ಸಹಾಯಕವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಅನ್ಯಥಾ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರಯೋಗ ಶಾಲೆಗಳಿಂದ ಪಡೆದ ಅನುಭವದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅದರ ಸಾಧಕ ಬಾಧಕಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ವಾರೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಈ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾಗಿದೆ. ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ಏಕಾಏಕಿ ಪೂರ್ವಾಪರ ಯೋಚನೆಯಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಕಾರ್ಯಾರಂಭ ಮಾಡಿದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಧ್ಯದಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುವ ಎಡರು ತೊಡರುಗಳಿಂದ ಪ್ರಮಾದವಾಗುವ ಸಂಭವವಿದೆ. ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾ ಪ್ರಸಾರ ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿ ಆಗಬೇಕು, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕ ಎಲ್ಲ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನೂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ವಿರೋಧಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವುಳ್ಳವರಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದೇ ನನ್ನ ನಂಬಿಕೆ; ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳೊಳಗೆ ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಏನು ತೊಂದರೆಗಳಿವೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯಿಂದ ಯೋಚಿಸಬೇಕು.

ನನ್ನೆಂದು ದಿವಸ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟನವರು ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ವಾತನಾದುತ್ತಾ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ಮಾಡಲೇಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಬೇರೆಯವರು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಅವರು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಿದೆ. ಅವರು ನನ್ನೆ ಮೊನ್ನೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ದ್ದಾಗ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಿರುವ ಪ್ರತಿಬಂಧಕಗಳ ಅರಿವು ಇತರ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗಿಂತ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವರು ಆಗ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಉತ್ತರಗಳು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಜ್ಞಾಪಕದಲ್ಲಿವೆ.

ಆ ಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾಗ ಅವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಜ್ಞಾಪಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಲು ಆಗಬೇಕಾದ ಅನುಕೂಲಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಹೊಂದಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ. ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟಕಾಲದೊಳಗೆ ಎರಡು ಬಾಲಕರನ್ನೂ ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಎಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಎಷ್ಟು ನ್ಯಾಯ

ಗಳು ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತವೆ, ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನ ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರು ಗಳು ಬೇಕು, ಎಂಬವೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ರೆಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಿ ಒಂದು ಯೋಜನೆಯನ್ನು ತಯಾರು ಮಾಡುವುದರ ಮೂಲಕ ನಾರ್ಕಾರು ಅಥವಾ ಹತ್ತಾರು ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಆತ ಈಡೇರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಇದು ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಸರಿ. ಏಕಾಏಕಿ ಒಂದು ಹೊಸ ಏರ್ಪಾಡನ್ನು ಜರೂರು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದರಿಂದ ಅನೇಕ ಕಷ್ಟ ನಷ್ಟ ಬರುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂದೇಹವಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಹೇಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆಯಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟು ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹಣವನ್ನು ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸಕ್ಕೆ ಒದಗಿಸಬಹುದೆಂಬುದನ್ನೂ ಗಮನಿಸಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಉದ್ಯಮವು ಬಹಳ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾದರೂ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಮೇಲಿನ ದೃಷ್ಟಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೆಯೂ, ಸಾಧಕ ಬಾಧಕಗಳ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡದೆಯೂ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದ ಮಾತ್ರವಲ್ಲದೆ ಮಕ್ಕಳಿಗಿರಲೂ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಯೇ ಎಂಬುದೂ ಸಹ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಅನುಮಾನ ಗ್ರಸ್ತವಾದ ವಿಷಯ. ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬ ನಿಗೂ ತನ್ನ ಮಕ್ಕಳನ್ನು ವಿದ್ಯಾ ವಂತರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಆಶೆ ತನ್ನ ಅಂತರಂಗ ದಲ್ಲಿ ಹುಟ್ಟಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದರೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ವಿನಃ ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡಿ ಜನರು ಮಕ್ಕಳನ್ನು ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸದಿದ್ದರೆ, ಶಿಕ್ಷೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಭಯ ಹಾಕುವುದರಿಂದ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಆಶೆ ಈಡೇರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ವಿಷಯ. ಇಂಥ ವಿಷಯ ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದಷ್ಟೂ ಜನರ ಅಂತಃಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಶೆ ಹುಟ್ಟುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅಂತಹ ಒಂದು ವಾತಾ ವರಣವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ತನ್ನಷ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ತಾನೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಬೆಳೆದು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಕಾನೂನಿನ ಬಲದಿಂದ ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡಿಸುವ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮದಿಂದ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪವೂ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದು ಉತ್ತಮವಾದಂಥ ಪ್ರಯೋಗವೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚಿಸಬೇಕು. ಸಾಮಾ ನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಸಾಮಾಜಿಕ ಕಾನೂ ನು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅವನ್ನು ಎರೋದಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬುದೇ ನಮ್ಮ ಜನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಳೆದು ಬಂದಿರುವ ಮನೋಭಾವ. ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಜನಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ಮಕ್ಕಳನ್ನು ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಬೇಕು. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಆಶೆ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇಲ್ಲ. ತಮ್ಮ ಮಕ್ಕಳಿಗೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡಿಸ ಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಆಶೆ ಅವರಿಗೂ ಇದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅನೇಕ ಪ್ರತಿ ಬಂಧಕಗಳಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಮಕ್ಕಳನ್ನು ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ಪ್ರತಿಬಂಧಕ ಗಳನ್ನು ನಿವಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದ ಹೊರತು, ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡಿ ಅದರ ಬಲಪ್ರಯೋಗದಿಂದ ಮಕ್ಕಳು ವಿದ್ಯಾ ಭ್ಯಾಸಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದರೆ.....

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಹತ್ತು ವರ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ವಾಗಿ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕಾನ್ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಧಾಯಕವಾಗಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚೆನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪನವರು.—10 ವರ್ಷ ದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರನ್ನೂ ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದೆ. ಬರಾತ್ಕಾರವಾಗಿಯೇ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—Directive Principles ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಇದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚೆನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪನವರು.—The object of the Constitution is that all boys must be made to attend school and become educated. ಬರಾತ್ಕಾರ ವಿದ್ಯಾ ಭ್ಯಾಸ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರದೆ ಆ ಗುರಿಯನ್ನು ಮುಟ್ಟುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದು ಏಕೆ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು? ಕಾನ್ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ವಿಷಯ ಹೇಳಿ ದ್ದಾರೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸ ಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ನನ್ನ ಇಚ್ಛೆವಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೂ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಆನೆ ಏನೆಂದರೆ 10 ವರ್ಷದೊಳಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲರನ್ನೂ ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವ ಒಂದು ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಇರ ಬೇಕು. ಅದು ಬರಾತ್ಕಾರವಾಗಿಯೇ ಆಗಬೇಕೇ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇರೆ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಮಾರ್ಗ ಇದೆಯೆ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಕಾನ್ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕ ಗುರಿ ಯನ್ನು ಮುಟ್ಟುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇರೆ ಮಾರ್ಗದಿಂದ ಸಾಧ್ಯ ವಾಗುವ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಏಕೆ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು? ಮಕ್ಕಳನ್ನು ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಲಕ್ಕೆ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಏನು ತೊಂದರೆ ಇದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಸ್ವಾಭಾವಿಕವಾಗಿ ಅವರ ಅಂತರಂಗದಲ್ಲೇ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸದ ಮೇಲೆ ಒಂದು ಮಮತೆ ಹುಟ್ಟಿ ಮಕ್ಕಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸುವ ವಾತಾವರಣವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ವಿದ್ಯಾ ಪ್ರಸಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನೊಬ್ಬ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ವಿಷ ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವತ್ತೂ ಸಹಾನುಭೂತಿಯುಳ್ಳವರಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರ ಈ ಸಭೆಗೇ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಹಾಗಾಗಿವಾಗ ಇನ್ನು ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರಾತ್ಕಾರ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸವನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಬೇಕೆಂದು ನೂಟಿಸಿರುವ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ವನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕಾರ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಇರುವ ಸಾಧಕ ಬಾಧಕಗಳನ್ನು, ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಉದಾರ ಮನೋ ಭಾವವೇನಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇ ಗೌಡರು ಅರಿತವರಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಈ ನಿರ್ಣ ಯವನ್ನು ಒತ್ತಾಯಪಡಿಸದೆ ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri B. Hutche Gowda will now reply to the debate.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡರು.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಅಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆಗಳು ಬಂದವು. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ರಂಗ ರಾಮಯ್ಯನವರು ಈಗಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರು ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ 35,000 ಜನ ಲೋಯರ್ ಸೆಕೆಂಡರಿ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿ ದ್ದಾರೆ. 13-14 ಸಾವಿರ ಜನ ಎಸ್.ಎಸ್.ಎಲ್.ಸಿ. ಗೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. 2½ ಸಾವಿರ ಜನ ಪದವೀಧರರಾಗು ತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದರಾದರೂ ಸರಿಯೇ ಅಷ್ಟೊಂದು ದುಡ್ಡನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರು ವಾಗ ಅವರನ್ನು ಏಕೆ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯವಾಗಿ ಕರೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಒಂದೆರಡು ವರ್ಷ ಮಕ್ಕಳಿಗೆ ಅವರಿಂದ ಪಾಠ ಹೇಳಿಸಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿಸಬಾರದು? ನನ್ನ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಇಷ್ಟೆ. ಈಗ ನೀವು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದ ರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರಿಗೆ ವಿದ್ಯೆ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಯಾರಿಗೆ ವಿದ್ಯೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿದೆಯೋ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಸಾಲಭ್ಯ ತಾವು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಇತರರಿಗೆ ತಪ್ಪಿಸಿರುವುದು ಹಾಸ್ಯಾಸ್ಪದವಾದದ್ದು. ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ದರು. ನಮಗೆ ಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದು ಪ್ರಪಂಚ ಜ್ಞಾನ. ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸವಾಗಿ ವರ್ತಮಾನ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆ ಓದಿಕೊಂಡು ತಕ್ಕಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಜ್ಞಾನ ಸಂಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡಲು

ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಲಿಭ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡುವುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಪ್ರಥಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಚೆನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪನವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿ ನನಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಆಶ್ಚರ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದಲ್ಲರವಂತೆ ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷ ಬಹಳ ಜಾಗೃತ ಅದ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದರು. ಈಗ ಕಾನ್ಸಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್ 45ನೇ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇದೆ...

"The State shall endeavour to provide, within a period of ten years from the commencement of this Constitution, for free and compulsory education for all children until they complete the age of fourteen years."

ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಅವರು ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ಕೊಡುವ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇನ್ನಾವ ವಿಧದ ನಿರ್ಬಂಧ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಕಾರಣವೇ ಇಲ್ಲ. ನೈತಿಕ ಮತ್ತು ಜ್ಞಾನ ಹೆಚ್ಚುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ನಿರ್ಬಂಧ ಮಾಡಬೇಡವೆಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದರೆ, ಬಾಕಿ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಪಾನನಿರೋಧ ಮುಂತಾದ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೆ! ಹಾಗಿದ್ದೂ ಅವರು ಈ ರೀತಿ ನಿರ್ಬಂಧ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುವ ಎಂದರೆ ಏನು ಅರ್ಥ! ತಾವಾಗಿಯೇ ತಾವು ವಿದ್ಯೆ ಕಲಿಯಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಶತಮಾನಗಳಾದರೂ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರಗಳವರಿಗೆ ಅವರ ಮನೆ ಬಾಗಿಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸದ ಸೌಕರ್ಯ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅನುಭವವಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಕೆಲವು ಕಾಲ ಆ ಜ್ಞಾನ ಬರುವವರೆಗೆ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಹತ್ತು ವರ್ಷದೊಳಗೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಸಾಧಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರ್ ಪ್ರಿನ್ಸ್‌ಪಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೆ. ಇವತ್ತು ನಾವು ಈ ಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು 10 ವರ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬನೂ ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತನಾಗಿ ಒಟ್ಟು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಈಗ ನಾವು ನಿರಕ್ಷರತೆಯನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ನೀವು 3 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಆದರೆ ಅದು ಯಾವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ! ಹೆಚ್ಚು ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರಾಗತಕ್ಕವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರವಲ್ಲ. ಸಂಬಳ, ಸಾರಿಗೆ, ತುಟ್ಟ ಭತ್ಯೆ ಇವುಗಳು ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅದೂ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಿದೆ ಅಷ್ಟೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳಿಂದ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. 13 ಲಕ್ಷ ಜನ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ವಯಸ್ಸಿನ ಹುಡುಗರಿರುವಾಗ 70 ಸಾವಿರ ಜನ ಹುಡುಗರು ಮಾತ್ರ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನೀವು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ದುಡ್ಡು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವರ್ಷ ವಿನಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. 10 ವರ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಸಾಧಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಒಂದು ಯೋಜನೆ ಯಾವುದನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷದಲ್ಲೇ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೂ ಮೂರು ನಾಲ್ಕು ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಯೋಜನೆ ಹಾಕಿ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ನಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವಲ್ಲವೇ! ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈಗ ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ ರೋಷ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಕಾರ್ಯಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಹಿಂದೆ ಬಿಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ನಡೆದದ್ದು ನಡೆದು ಹೋಯಿತು. ಆದರೆ ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದಕ್ಕಾದರೂ ತಾವು ಕಡ್ಡಾಯವಾಗಿ ಈ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದು ಎಷ್ಟು ಪಾಠಶಾಲೆ

ಗಳನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಲಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿದೆಯೋ ಅಷ್ಟನ್ನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಕನಿಷ್ಠ ಪಕ್ಷ 500 ಹುಡುಗರಿಗೆ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಪಾಠಶಾಲೆಗಳಂತೆ ಈ ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತೆರೆದರೆ ಇನ್ನು ಹತ್ತು ವರ್ಷದ ಅವಧಿಗಿಂತ ಇನ್ನೂ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿಯೇ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬನನ್ನೂ ಅಕ್ಷರಸ್ಥನನ್ನಾಗಿ ತರಬಹುದು. ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಅನಾಥ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದಲ್ಲರವ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

* ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಸಿದ್ದಲಿಂಗಯ್ಯನವರು (ವಿದ್ಯಾ ಸಚಿವರು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡರು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಠರಾವನ್ನು except on one point—time factor ಯಾರೂ ವಿರೋಧಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಾದ್ಯಂತ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಎಷ್ಟು ಅಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದ ಕೆಲಸವೆಂಬುದು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರವೇ ಆಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಎಲ್ಲರನ್ನೂ ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕಡೆಯೂ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಸಿದ್ದಲಿಂಗಯ್ಯನವರು.—ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಬೇರೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಪಾಠಶಾಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ತೆರೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅಷ್ಟೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ!

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಸಿದ್ದಲಿಂಗಯ್ಯನವರು.—ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಹೇಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಹೇಗೆ ಆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಅವರು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇನ್ನು Compulsory Education ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚೆನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪನವರು ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ನಂತರ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಆ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟುಮಾತ್ರ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು. ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸದ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಇತರರಿಗಿಂತ ಯಾವ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಹಿಂದೆ ಬಿದ್ದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಆದರೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತಿಳಿಸಿರುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ 14 ವರ್ಷದೊಳಗಿರುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಮಕ್ಕಳಿಗೂ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ತತ್ವವನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಯಾರೂ ಏನೂ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪಡುವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ತತ್ವವನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವೇನಿರುತ್ತೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅರಿತಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಮತ್ತು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡಿಸುವ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಹೊತ್ತು ಆದರೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗಿದೆಯೆಂಬುದನ್ನೂ ಅರಿತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯ ಬಂದಿರುವಾಗ, ಅದರ ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳು ಉದ್ಧರವಾಗಿ, ದೇಶ ಮುಂದುವರಿಯಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಆ ವಿದ್ಯಾ ಪ್ರಗತಿಯ ಪ್ರತಿಭೆ ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರಭಾವಗಳೆಂಬ ಆಯುಧಗಳ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೂ ಎಷ್ಟರ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅಗತ್ಯವಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಹತ್ತು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಒಂದು ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕಡೆಗಳಿಗೂ ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಪೂರ್ವಕವಾದ ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣವನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಕಾನ್ಸಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತಿಪಾದಿತವಾಗಿ

ರುವ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇತರ ದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿರುವಂತೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಈ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಪ್ಲಾನ್ ಇದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡರು ತಿಳಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ ನಾವು ಇತರರಿಗಿಂತಲೂ ಹೀಗೆ ಪ್ಲಾನ್ ಮಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಂದೆ ಬೀಳುವಂಥ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯೇನೂ ಇನ್ನೂ ಒದಗಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ಪ್ಲಾನುಗಳಿವೆ. ಈ ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಪ್ರಥಮ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಸಿದ್ಧವಾದ ಯೋಜನೆ ಇದ್ದೇ ಇದೆ. ಇದು 1946ರರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಯಿತು. ಹಾಗೆ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭ ಮಾಡಿದ ನಂತರ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲೂ ಒಂದೊಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಮಾಡಲಾಯಿತು. ಹೀಗೆ full compulsory education 9 ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ 9 ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಲಾಯಿತು. ಇನ್ನು compulsory attendance ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲೂ 3 ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳಂತೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದು ಈಗ ಅದು ಕ್ರಮೇಣ ಆಗಿ ನಾಲ್ಕು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳಿಗೆ ಆವರಿಸಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ಎಚ್. ಚಂದ್ರಶೇಖರಯ್ಯನವರು (ಚಿತ್ರದುರ್ಗ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ).—ಆದು ಹಾಗಲ್ಲ, Compulsory attendance ಪದ್ಧತಿಯು 1945-46ನೆಯ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಗಿ ಈ ನಾಲ್ಕು ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ವರ್ಷ ೬೦ ದಕ್ಕಿ ಮೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಾರ 36 ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಇನ್ನು compulsory education ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೋದ ವರ್ಷದಿಂದ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲೂ ಒಂದೊಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಂತೆ 9 ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ 9 ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಜಾರಿ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಸಿದ್ದಲಿಂಗಯ್ಯನವರು.—ಹೀಗೆ 9 ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ 36 ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ತರಹ part compulsory educationನನ್ನೂ, ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಕಡೆ 9 ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ತರಹ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ full compulsory educationನನ್ನೂ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇದರ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲವರಿಗೆ ಈಗ ಒಂದು ಸಂದೇಹ ಬಂದಿದೆ; ಕೆಲವು ದೂರುಗಳೂ ಸಹ. ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧವಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿವೆ. ವಿಚಾರವೇನೆಂದರೆ ಅನೇಕರು ತಮ್ಮ ಮಕ್ಕಳನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಪಾಠಶಾಲೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸದೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ನಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯವಹಾರ ಹೂಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಅಮಲ್ದಾರು ಸ್ಕೂಲ್ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಟರು ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ಯವರ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ನಂತರ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಜುರಾನೆ ತೆರಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಇಂಥಾ ಒಂದು compulsory education ನನ್ನು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತರುವುದು ಅಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಕೆಲವರು ಒಂದು ಸಂಶಯವನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಅಂತಹ ಸಂಶಯ ಯಾವುದೂ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೈಗೊಂಡಿರುವ ಕಾರ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಿಂದಾಗ್ಯೂ ವರದಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಒಬ್ಬ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯುತವಾದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಇದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡರು.—ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಹೋದ ವರ್ಷ ತಾವೇಕೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಸಿದ್ದಲಿಂಗಯ್ಯನವರು.—ಒಬ್ಬ ಸ್ಪರ್ಶ ಅಭಿವರನ್ನು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಅವರನ್ನು ಇನ್ನೂ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲವಾದಕಾರಣ

ಹೋದವರ್ಷ ಇದನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದನ್ನು ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಿ ಅವರು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಾಧಕ ಬಾಧಕಗಳನ್ನು ವರದಿ ಮಾಡಿದನಂತರ, ಅದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಮುಂದಿನವರ್ಷ ಇದನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದಿರುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಹತ್ತು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಧರವನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದೆ. ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೂ ಕೂಡ ಇದೇ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವರು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಹೀಗೆ ಒಂದು ನಿಗದಿಯಾದ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಂಥದ್ದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಅವರ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಉಲ್ಲಂಘನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಆತುರಪಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಮುಂದುವರಿಯುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ನಿಧಾನವಾಗಿ ಹೆಜ್ಜೆಯಿಡುತ್ತೇ ಮುಂದುವರಿಯೋಣವೆಂದು ಮನಸ್ಸು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈಗ 36 ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಕ್ರಮ ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದು ಅದು ಮುಂದುವರಿಯುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈಗ ನಾವು ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿರುವ ವೇಗವನ್ನು ಎರಡರಷ್ಟು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ನಾವು ಇನ್ನು 2 ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಹಾಗೆ ಇನ್ನು 2 ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲೇ ಇದನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದರೆ ಅಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಿಡಿಯೇ ಅಥವಾ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗತಕ್ಕ ಖರ್ಚಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತೆ ಬರುವ ಪ್ರತಿಫಲಕ್ಕೂ ಸಂಬಂಧವಿರುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಅನುಮಾನ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಪ್ರಯುಕ್ತ ಇದನ್ನು 10 ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಯೋಜನೆ ಯನ್ನು ನಿಶ್ಚಿತಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಆ ಕಾಲದೊಳಗಾಗಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಲು ಸಿದ್ಧರಾಗಿರುತ್ತೇವೆಂಬ ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಪರವಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಈಗ ತಮಗಲ್ಲ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು.

ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಮಗೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಒಂದು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಭರವಸೆ ಇದೆ. ಈ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯು ನಾವು ನಿಗದಿಮಾಡಿರುವ ಹತ್ತು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಅವಧಿಗಿಂತಲೂ ಇನ್ನೂ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿಯೇ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬರಬಹುದೆಂಬ ಭರವಸೆಕೂಡ ನಮಗೆ ಉಂಟಾಗಿದೆ. ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಿಂದ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹೆಚ್ಚುಮಂದಿ ಉತ್ತೀರ್ಣರಾಗಿ ಬರುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವರಲ್ಲಿರೂ ದೊಡ್ಡ ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರುಗಳು. ಇವರುಗಳನ್ನು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿಯ ಜನಗಳನ್ನು ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಯೋಜನೆಯನ್ನು ಕೇಂದ್ರದವರು ತಯಾರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದರಂತೆ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಆಚರಿಸುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ಅವರು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಒಂದು ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಸಹ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಕೂಡ ನಾವು ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

ನಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತೇರ್ಗಡೆ ಹೊಂದಿ ಬರುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಪದವೀಧರರೂ ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಡಿಗ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿ, ಅವರು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಜನರಿಗೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡಿಸಿ ಬರುವಂಥ ಒಂದು ಯೋಜನೆ ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ತೀವ್ರಾಲೋಚನೆಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ.

ಈಗ ಅದರ ವೆಚ್ಚದ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಮಾತು ಹೇಳಬೇಕು. ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವಂತೆ compulsory ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ಪದ ಸೇರಿಸುವುದರಿಂದಲೇ ಹಾಲಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸಕ್ಕೆ ಒಟ್ಟು ಎಷ್ಟು ಒದಗಿಸಿದೆಯೋ ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ 20 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಯಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಈ ಮೊಬಲಗನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಒದಗಿಸುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ವಿಚಾರ. ಆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿ

ಬಂದರೇ ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕ ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷ ಎನ್ನುವು ನನ್ನ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ತಾವೇ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಹತ್ತು ವರ್ಷ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೊಂಡು ಮೈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ತಿದ್ದುವಾಟು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ನಾನೇ ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಈ ರೀತಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನೂ ವಿವರವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿ ಕೊಂಡೆ. ಇಷ್ಟು ಹೇಳಿಯೂ ತಾವು ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷವೇ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ವಿವರವಾಗಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನೂ ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂಚೂಣಿಯಲ್ಲಿ, ಅದ್ಭುತವೆಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷದ time-limit ಹಾಕಿರುವುದು ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಅನುಭವವಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡರು ಈ ಠರಾವನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಂಬಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡರು.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಉತ್ತರವು ನನಗೆ ಸಮಾಧಾನಕರವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ನಾನು press ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is.

"That this Assembly is of the opinion that universal compulsory primary education should be enforced within the next two years throughout the State".

The motion was negatived.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಸಿದ್ದಲಿಂಗಯ್ಯನವರು.—ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡರು ಇಂಥಾ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟು persist ಮಾಡಿ ಇದು defeat ಆಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಕೂಡದೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Next resolution.....
(Sri M. Govinda Reddy stood up). Sri. Bhimappa Naik.

Sri M. GOVINDA REDDY.—Since the next resolution was called, Sir, I may be permitted to move it and the previous resolution may be moved afterwards.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಿನ್ನೆ ದಿವಸ ಬಾಸಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕರಾಚಿಗಳಿರುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಅನೇಕರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೂ ಅದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾರು ಹಾಜರಿರಲೋ ಅವರನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡೆವು. ಬ್ಯಾರಿಸ್ಟರ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಹಾಕಿರುವ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಿ ಮಾಡುವ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ನಿನ್ನೆ ದಿವಸ ಅನೇಕರಿಗೆ ಹಾಗೆ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಗೊತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವಾದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡೆವು. ಈಗ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು.

Resolution No. 7.

Board for Development of Industrial Concerns run by Government.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕರು (ಚಿತ್ರದುರ್ಗ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನನ್ನ ಠರಾವು ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿದೆ.—

"This Assembly is of the opinion that the Government of Mysore should set up an autonomous Board for the development of industrial concerns started and managed by the Government."

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೆಲವು ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ತಾವೇ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಮಾಡಿ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಚಿಕ್ಕಪುಟ್ಟ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳು. ಮತ್ತೆ ಕೆಲವು ಬೇಸಿಗೆ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳಾಗಿ ಯಾವುದರಿಂದ ಜನತೆಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ಸಾಮಾನುಗಳನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸಬಹುದೋ—ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ ಭದ್ರಾವತಿ ಕಬ್ಬಿಣದ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆ, ಸಿಮೆಂಟ್ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆ, ಕಾಗದದ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆ—ಅಂಥವುಗಳು. ಹೀಗೆಯೇ ಅವರ ಅಡಳಿತದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ನಡೆಸತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲವು ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳು ಬೇರೆ ಇವೆ. ಇವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಬಹುಮತದ ಜೇರು ಬಂಡವಾಳವನ್ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಅದರ ಅಡಳಿತವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಇನ್ನೊಂದನ್ನು ಒಂದು ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೋದ್ಯಮವೆಂದೇ ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಅದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಚಾರ್ನ್ ಪೋರ್ಟ್ ವೆಸ್ಟಿಂಗ್‌ಗಳನ್ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಇಂಥ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಬಹು ದಿವಸಗಳ ಹಿಂದೆಯೇ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಮಾಡಿ ಬೆಳೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸೋಫ್ ಎಂಬಂಥ ಪ್ರಪಂಚದಲ್ಲೇ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಒಂದು ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಆದರೆ, ಈಗ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳು ಹೊರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗಿನ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕನುಗುಣವಾಗಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಕೆಲಸಗಳು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿವೆಯೋ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಇವು ಈಗಿನ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರೋದ್ಯಮ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿವೆಯೇ, ಈ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳು ಇತರ ಬಾಸಗಿಯವರ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸರಿಸಮಾನವಾಗಿವೆಯೇ, ಇಲ್ಲ ತಯಾರಾಗುವ ಪದಾರ್ಥಗಳ ಬೆರೆ ವೆಸ್ಟಿಂಗ್ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿವೆಯೇ ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲಯೂ ಹೊಸ ಮೆಷಿನ್ ತಂದು ಬಾಸಗಿ ಜನರು ಹೊಸ ಹೊಸ ಯಂತ್ರೋಪಕರಣಗಳನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಬಾಸ್ತಿಮಾಡುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ, ಹೊರಗಡೆ market ನ್ನು capture ಮಾಡಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಾಮಾನುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಬೆಲೆಗೆ ಮಾರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ, ಈಗ ತಕ್ಕ ವಿರ್ಪಾಡುಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ್ದೂ ಅತ್ಯಾವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇಂಥ ಅನೇಕ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಈ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುತ್ತವೆ.

ಆದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಡಳಿತದಲ್ಲಿ ರೆಡ್ ಚೀಪಿನಸಮ್ ಎಂಬುದು ಇರುವುದು ಸಾಧಾರಣ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ಅಡಳಿತವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋದರೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ತನ್ನ ಬಗಿಯನ್ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡೇ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಸಾಮಾನುಗಳು ಪೂರಾಗದಂತೆ, ಶಿಸ್ತಿಗೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆಯಾದಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲೂ ಯಾವ ನಿಯಮಿತ ರೀತಿ ವಿಧಾನದ ರೀತ್ಯಾ ಹೋಗಬೇಕೋ ಹಾಗೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಂಥಾದ್ದರಿಂದಲೂ ಈ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೋದ್ಯಮಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ಒರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ವೇಳೆ ಕೆಲವು ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ಕೆಲವು ಸಾಮಾನುಗಳನ್ನು ಇಂದು ನಾವು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ನಾಳೆ ದಿವಸ ಅದರಿಂದಲೇ ಹತ್ತಾರುಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಲುಕ್ಕಾನಾಗಬಹುದು. ಅಕಸ್ಮಾತ್ ಒಂದು ದಿವಸ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆ ನಿಂತುಹೋದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ನಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಇತರ ಕೆಲಸಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈ

ರಿತಿಯಾದ ನಷ್ಟವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಾ ದರೋ ಈ ವಿಧವಾದ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಬ್ಬೊಬ್ಬ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ಅವರವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅನೇಕ ಇಲಾಖೆಗಳನ್ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಒಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ದಕ್ಕತೆಯಿಂದ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟ. ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಹೊಸ ಯಂತ್ರವನ್ನಾಗಲೀ, spare part ನ್ನಾಗಲೀ ತಕ್ಷಣ ತರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹತ್ತಾರು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಇಂಥ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಕಷ್ಟವಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ 10,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಂಜೂರುಮಾಡುವ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದ್ದರೂ, 10,000 ದಿಂದ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅದು ಕ್ಯಾಬಿನೆಟ್‌ಗೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದಲ್ಲದೆ ಅನೇಕ ವಾಗಿ ಕಾಲ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಆಗಿ ಆ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಬೇಕೋ ಅದು ಸಿಕ್ಕದೆ ಬಹಳ ತೊಂದರೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಮೆಷಿನರಿಂಗ್‌ಗೆ ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಸ್ಪೋರ್ಟ್ಸ್ ಪರ್ಫಾರ್ಮೆನ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಹೋಗಬೇಕೆಂದಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಆ ಕಂಪೆನಿ ಸ್ಪೋರ್ಟ್ಸ್ ಪರ್ಫಾರ್ಮೆನ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಿಂದ Recognise ಆಗಿರಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅನೇಕ ಸಾಮಾನುಗಳು ಅರೆಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲೆ ಸ್ಪೋರ್ಟ್ಸ್ ಪರ್ಫಾರ್ಮೆನ್ಸ್‌ಕಮಿಟಿಯಿಂದ Recognise ಆಗದಿರುವ ಕಡೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವಂತಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಅಲ್ಲ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಬೆಲೆಗೂ ಸಿಕ್ಕಬಹುದು. ಸ್ಪೋರ್ಟ್ಸ್ ಪರ್ಫಾರ್ಮೆನ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ಸಲಹೆಯಂತೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೊಂದಕ್ಕೂ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದು. ಅದರೂ ಅದನ್ನೇ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದಕ್ಕೇ ಒಂದು ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯುತವಾದ ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ ಹೊರತು ಬೇರೆ ದಾರಿಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ, ಪ್ರಚಾರದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಾದ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವುದು, ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಯ costing ವಿಷಯ—ಇವುಗಳೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಲ್ಲದೆ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ Businessmen ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆಂದೂ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಕ್ಯಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇವಲ ಒಂದೇ ತರಹ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ವಿಧವಿಧವಾದ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳಿವೆ. ಯಾರಿಗೋ ಒಬ್ಬನಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅನುಭವವಿದ್ದರೂ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಅನುಭವವಿರುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಯಾವ ಮಂತ್ರಿವರ್ಗ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಾಗಲೀ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಳದ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಾಗಲೀ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ, ನನ್ನ ಸಲಹೆಯೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗೂ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ನ್ನು ರಚಿಸಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅವರ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಸಾಧಕವಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಆ ರೀತಿ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಾದ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯವನ್ನೂ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದು. ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು autonomous ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅಂಥಾ ಯಾವ ವಿಶೇಷ ಪಾರ್ಲಮೆಂಟರಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. ಆಯಾ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸುವ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಪೂರ್ಣ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇ ಹೊರತು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮೇಲ್ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯಿರಬೇಕೆಂದೆಲ್ಲ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಆಡಳಿತಾಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಒಳಪಟ್ಟು ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ ಆಗಾಗ್ಗೆ ಸೇರಿಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಬೆಳೆಸಬೇಕು,

ಅದರ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳೇನು, ಅದರ ವೈಶಿಷ್ಟ್ಯವೇನು ಎಂಬದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಲು ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯವಿರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ.

ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರದೇಶದ ಉದಾಹರಣೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಸಾಧಾರಣವಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ನಡೆಸುವ ಅನೇಕ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಇಂಥ ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ನ್ನು, ಆ ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದ್ದು ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆ ಬೆಳೆವಣಿಗೆಗೆ ನೂಕು ಕಾಯ್ದೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕ ನೂಕನೆ, ಸಲಹೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ಬೇಕಾದ ಅನುಕೂಲತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಿಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿರಬೇಕು. ಅಂಥ ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ ಈಗಿನ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕ ಹಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳು ಕೆಲವರು ಹೇಳುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಕೆಲವು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ದಿವಸ ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಹಾಸನದ ಇಂಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟ್ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿಯು ರಾಜಧಾನಿಯಂತೆ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಬರಬರುತ್ತಾ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ತೊಂದರೆಯಿದ್ದೇ ಇದೆ. ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಬಿ. ಗುಂಡಪ್ಪಗೌಡರು ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಅದು ರಾಜಧಾನಿಯಂತೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ, ತೊಂದರೆಯಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಪ್ರೋಟೆಸ್ಟ್ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಲು 'ಬಂದಿದೆ ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ' ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅಂದರೆ ಒಂದು ಸಾಧಾರಣ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಯು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದರೆ, ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳಾದರೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಏನೂ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ, ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದು ಉದಮದಾರನಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ್ದು ಖಾಸಗಿ ಉದ್ಯಮವಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ! ಇದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದವರು ಇದನ್ನು ಉದಾಸೀನವಾದದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರಿಗಿರುವ ಸಹಸ್ರಾರು ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇದರ ಮೇಲೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ನಿಗಾ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಾಧಾರಣವಾಗಿ ಅನೇಕ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕಾ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಪ್ರತಿ ತಿಂಗಳೂ ಆಧಾಯವನ್ನು ನೋಡುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ರಾಜಧಾನಿಯಂತೆಯೇ, ಇಲ್ಲವೇ, ಮಾರ್ಕೆಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಲೆ ಇದೆಯೇ, ಇಲ್ಲವೆ, ಎಂದು ನೋಡಿ ಪ್ರೋಟೆಸ್ಟ್‌ನಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕಂತೆ ನಡೆಯಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಪಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಣದ ಸೌಕರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಒದಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕಾ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಒಂದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ನವರು ಕೇಳಿದಾಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹಣ ಒದಗಿಸಿ ಲೆಕ್ಕವನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಇಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅನೇಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂಟ್ರೋಲಿಂಗಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಇಲಾಖೆಗೂ ಸಂಬಂಧವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದರ ಲೆಕ್ಕದ ರೀತಿನೀತಿಯೇ ಬೇರೆ. ಖಾಸಗಿ ಒಂದನ್ನು ಕೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಇಲಾಖೆಯು ಲೆಕ್ಕವಿಡುವ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯು ಸರಿಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ಇದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಂಬಂಧವಿಲ್ಲ. ಆಯಾ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿಯ ರೀತಿ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ನಾನು ಲೆಕ್ಕವಿಡುವ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯಿರಬೇಕು. ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾಡಲು ಇಂಥ ಸಮಿತಿಗಳು ಉಪಸಮಿತಿಗಳಿದ್ದ ಹಾಗೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿಬಾಳೆ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪನವರು ಒಂದು ಉದಾಹರಣೆ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಭದ್ರಾವತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟ್ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ರಾಜಧಾನಿಯಂತೆ

ಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಒಂದು ಮುಷಿನರಿ ಇರುವ ಕಡೆ ವಿಶೇಷ ಸಹಾಯವೇನಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಬೇಕು. ಕಚ್ಚಾ ಸಾಮಾನು ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತದೆ, ಕೂಲಿಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತದೆಯೆ ಮುಂತಾದ್ದನ್ನು ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ management, money, market, machinery, man-power, motive-power, material ಮುಂತಾದ ಏಳು ಅನುಕೂಲಗಳಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸರ್ ಎಂ. ವಿಶ್ವೇಶ್ವರಯ್ಯನವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒಂದು ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೋದ್ಯಮವು ಬೆಳೆಯಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಇವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಈ ಏಳು ಸಾಮಾನುಗಳೆಲ್ಲ ಅದು ಇದ್ದೂ ಒಂದು ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೂ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗಬಹುದು. ಅಥವಾ ಅದು ಸಾಮಾನುಗಳಿದ್ದೂ ಅಡ್ಡಳತವು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೂ ಪೂರ್ಣ ತೊಂದರೆಯಿದೆ. ಇವೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಹಾಕಿ ಎಲ್ಲ ಯಾವುದು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಸರಿಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ದೊಡ್ಡ ನಿಪುಣರೇ ಇರಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರೇ ಅಡ್ಡಳತ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡಿರಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಂಥ ಬೋರ್ಡಿದ್ದೂ ಸರ್ ಎಂ. ವಿಶ್ವೇಶ್ವರಯ್ಯನವರವರು ಯಜಮಾನರಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಇತರ ಕಡೆಗೂ ಆ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಲಹೆಕೊಡುವ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡು ಅಗತ್ಯ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಯೂ ಬೆಳೆಯುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ದಯಮಾಡಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೋರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Resolution moved:

"That this Assembly is of the opinion that the Government of Mysore should set up an autonomous Board for the development of industrial concerns started and managed by the Government."

Sri H. C. DASAPPA (Minister for Finance and Industries).—I hope I will have a chance to speak.

A VOICE.—There are others also, Sir, to speak on this resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER.—But we have to close the debate on this resolution at 10-30.

*Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Hassan District—General).—I wholeheartedly support the resolution moved by my Hon'ble friend who has very ably and comprehensively dealt with the situation. That a large number of industries are under the control of the Government is a fact. It is difficult for one person or a set of persons to completely manage one industry. While that is so, one Industries Minister and one Director of Industries and a small establishment are absolutely not capable of managing all the industries to their best advantage or in a most efficient manner. May be the best of people are at the helm of affairs. But it is humanly impossible to put

themselves to that very heavy strain. That means to say, as in the case of administrative and other departments, decentralisation is necessary. I take it that Sri Bheemappa Naik wants that the management of these institutions, should be so arranged that a small body of persons capable of looking into the affairs of these institutions, day after day, month after month in a most comprehensive manner, must be in charge of each individual concern. Without transgressing any decency, I want to point out one or two cases which go to show what irregularities there are inherent in the situation. I will cite an instance. Take the Match Factory. I learn that it has been closed.

Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—It is not a Government aided institution."

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—it is mostly managed by Government though not aided. I take it that this industry is very vital to the people. Its importance was well realised during war time. That such a small industry for which you have got ample resources of timber and other materials should remain closed is a matter for concern. I would like to bring to your notice the case of another industry—Belagola industry. There we have a very highly technical efficient personnel. But it remains closed for six months. Why? I do not want to multiply instances. These are just instances to show the urgency of the situation, the necessity for some action. Therefore I commend this resolution for the acceptance of the House and I wish that the Hon'ble Minister will take it in that light.

Sri G. A. ACHARYA (Bangalore District—General).—Sir, I rise to support the resolution brought forward by my Hon'ble friend Sri Bheemappa Naik for setting up an autonomous Board for the development of industrial concerns started and managed by the Government. This is very necessary. The Government of Mysore are starting industries and are already running industries. Why do they start industries? It is to provide work and at the same time to give training to other people so that they might start their

own industries. In other words, the people who learn here should be able to start their own industries elsewhere. Secondly, there is the question of capital. Much is invested in each industry. Therefore, is it not desirable that each industry should be grouped together, that two or three people should be appointed to that industry and that they should be given complete freedom to act, to take prompt decisions and to manage that industry? Take for example the electrical industries. Why should they not group these allied industries together and have a little less official control? As it is they have no freedom at all. Everytime you interfere, there is no effect at all. Take for example a concern wherein is invested fifty lakhs of rupees. The head of such a concern, just as the head of a department of Government, must scrutinise everything that is done in the concern in detail—he must put his soul in his work and see whether a man within the given time has produced the expected result. Supposing a turner, a workman is expected to do eight hours of work and produce certain things and supposing the head of that concern does not know anything about these things; then is it not a loss? I wish to impress upon the Government that the head of a concern should have as much freedom as a Minister. Money must produce more money. The Head of the Department should be able to know what a thing which is produced in the concern costs, what is the cost of the same which is produced outside, whether he is making a profit out of the things produced when sold. The top-men must know their jobs pretty well and must determine whether a man employed in the concern is giving his very best. For eight hours of work that a man is paid, it should be seen that the desired result is forthcoming. What I want to stress upon the Government is this. Let them group industries. Let them appoint the right type of men for a particular line. Supervision is very important in running an industry. As a matter of fact, there are some officers who have no work in the sense that they do not know intimately in detail

everything pertaining to their concerns. Supposing an officer is appointed to look after a concern, he should stick to his job. He should be able to produce effective result from the money that is invested on the concern and that is possible only when you appoint the right type of men and not otherwise.

I am of opinion that complete freedom must be given to those top-men who manage these concerns. By all means tell the persons whom you appoint, that they should manage these concerns in a particular way. The men whom you appoint should be men who know all about the things they are going to manage. They should be technical men duly qualified to hold the job. Without such technical men you cannot run the industries. If we have to produce the desired result and get profit, these industries should be grouped together. Continuity is what is wanted. You should appoint such men whom you think are best in the line, and at the same time you must give them complete freedom also. By giving them complete freedom, you will be really establishing a good example. Not only will the Government get a good name in the administration of the State but also in running industries. I want that complete freedom should be given and with these words, in the name of increased economic production, I support the resolution.

Sri V. M. MASCARENHAS (Retired Area—General): Sir, I support the resolution. In doing so I wish to say that this brings us to the question of Government management *versus* private management. I think in this connection there are no two opinions. The country's experience is that Government managed concerns cannot be as efficient as the private managed ones. I think that is the trend of the talk of the Hon'ble mover of this resolution. It cannot be denied that Government managed concerns have no flexibility; they cannot lay down definite policies and cannot move with the same speed as the non-Government concerns. In view of this I feel that this resolution needs very serious consideration on the part of Government and I commend it,

Rajamantrapravina H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA (Hassan District—General).—I would like to say a few things against the resolution.

ಈ ಠರಾವು ನೋಡುವುದಕ್ಕೇನೋ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ autonomous board ಎಂದರೆ ಏನೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡೋಣ. ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗೆ ಹಣ ಹಾಕಿರುವುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು. ಇಂಥಾದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಹತ್ತು ಹನ್ನೆರಡು ಜನರನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಒಂದು Autonomous board ಎಂದು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ದಿಗಿಲಾದರೂ ಏನಿರುತ್ತದೆ? Autonomous ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನಾಳೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಾದರೂ ಬಂದಾವು ಎಂಬ ಭಯವೂ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಆ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ interest ಕೂಡ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರೇನಾದರೂ ಹಣ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದರೆ interest ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಏನಾದರೂ ಅಷ್ಟಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ enforce ಕೂಡ ಮಾಡುವ ಹಾಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ discipline enforce ಮಾಡುವುದು ತಾನೆ ಹೇಗೆ? ಅವರೇನಾದರೂ ಆಸಕ್ತಿಯಿಂದ ತಮ್ಮ ಹಣ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ಇದೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ autonomous board ಎಂದರೆ ಏನರ್ಥ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕರು.—Autonomous Board ಎಂದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರು ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರರಾಗಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಹಣದ ವಿಚಾರ ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಬಿ. ಗುಂಡಪ್ಪಗೌಡರು.—ನನಗೆ ತೋರಿದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದು ಅಷ್ಟು ಸುಲಭವಲ್ಲ. ನಾಳೆ ಆ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರು ಬೇಗಬೇಗ ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕು, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಹತ್ತು ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಯಾವ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹಣ ಕೊಡುವುದು? ಹತ್ತು ಜನರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದು? ಹಾಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ನಾಳೆ ಅವರು ತಮಗೆ ಆ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವುದೇ ಬೇಡವೆಂದು ಹೊರಟು ಹೋದರೆ ಆಗ ಏನು ಮಾಡುವುದು? ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೇ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ, ಖಾಸಗಿ ಜನರಿಗಿರುವಷ್ಟು interest ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, red-tapism ಇರುತ್ತದೆ, ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಇಂತಹ ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು, ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು, ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳಾಗಿರುವವರು ಮಾಡದೇಯಿರುವ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು, ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ನನಗೆ ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಅನುಮಾನವಿದೆ. ದಿನಚರಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಆಡಳಿತ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲಾ ಯಾರು ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ?

We are talking of an autonomous Board. I seriously object to the term 'autonomous.' That is a serious thing which must be taken into consideration by the Government and also by the Hon'ble Members of this House. Therefore I oppose the resolution.

*Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—I feel I am called upon to reply to the Hon'ble Member Sri Gundappa Gowda who

objects to the word "autonomous." What I meant was that the Board should have some power to make suggestions and to give directions. Only to that extent I said the Board must be autonomous. If the Board which will be responsible to the Minister directly—the Minister may not have sufficient experience—is not autonomous, it will not be in a position to give directions. A Board consisting of some experts will be able to guide a particular industry. That was my conception. I never meant that it should have all autonomous powers. My friend asked what is the money they have invested and how can you hold them responsible. But what is the money that the Minister will have invested? He will have come without money and will go out without money. This Board which will consist of some experts will be in the interests of the State. Above them there will be the Minister; there will be the Government. All will be as much interested as the Hon'ble Member Sri Gundappa Gowda if he is a Chairman with certain capital. He cannot make an allegation against the Board as having no responsibility. There is the control of the Minister, the Government, and above all of the Legislature for proper management. It need not be autonomous if you do not want the word "autonomous", but they must have the right to guide, deliberate and improve the industry.

Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—Sir, I must say that I welcomed the debate on this subject. It is more or less realised that the wording of the resolution is not quite happy; it may not bring out the idea which the Hon'ble mover and the other members might have. I must premise the few remarks with a statement about what exactly the present state of affairs is so far as these industries are concerned.

We have got one group of industries, viz., the Mysore Iron and Steel Works. That is in Bhadravati. Then we have got another group—I am referring only to Government-owned industries—viz., Electrical Industries—the Government Factory and the Government Porcelain Factory in Bangalore. Then we have got the rest

of Government industries like the Silk Factory, the Hassan Implements Factory, the Soap Factory, the Sandal Oil Factory and so on.

With regard to the first group of industries, the Mysore Iron and Steel Works at Bhadravati, we have for a very long time a Board of Management on which are represented not only the experts connected with iron and steel, not only certain departmental heads who are vitally concerned with the working of the works but also certain representatives of the general public, members of the Legislature and the public. So that is one Board. Then we have got the Board of Management for the Government Electric Factory and for the Government Porcelain Factory. These two also are very important industries. There we have got on the Board experts, the Director of Industries, the Chief Electrical Engineer, the Director of the Indian Institute of Science, himself an expert in electricity, and two or three non-officials. That is another Board which deals with electrical group of industries. Then for all other concerns we have the Board of Management of Industrial Concerns, shortly called B. M. I. C. It is presided over by the Minister concerned on which there are the Director of Industries and Commerce, the Director of Chemical and Metallurgical Industries and so on. So that there is not a single Government-owned industry which is not under the control of one Board or another. The very idea which was now mooted by the Hon'ble mover, *viz.*, that we must have Boards for the management of these industries is already there and in operation. As to how they may be made more effective is a different matter.

It was rather difficult for me to understand whether the idea of the sponsor of this resolution was that there should be one autonomous Board for all the Government-owned industries or that there must be separate Boards. From what my Hon'ble friend Sri A. G. Ramachandra Rao said, it looked as if he was for separate Boards for the

several groups of industries. I think my Hon'ble friend Sri G. A. Acharya also supported the idea. I do not want to set much store on the actual wording of the resolution. I want to say what exactly the Government are doing now and what they are contemplating to do. About a couple of years ago a committee consisting of one Colonel Felton of U.S.A., a man of considerable experience and who till the other day was our agent in America, and some Directors—the Director of Industries and Commerce, the Director of Mysore Iron and Steel Works and others—considered this very question and they have reported to the Government. Their idea is to have an Industrial Directorate consisting of the Director of Chemical and Metallurgical Industries, the Director of Electrical Industries, the Director of Industries and Commerce, the Director of Finance, the Director of Sales, the Director of Purchases and the Director of Cottage Industries. We have been considering how best to implement the report of that body. It is not free from difficulties. In fact, the one problem that arises is whether it is a proper thing for us to have one Industrial Directorate or one autonomous Board to employ the word of my Hon'ble friend Sri Bheemappa Naik. The idea is that there must be control of Government within certain limits and there must be equally freedom for the Directorate to take action. There must not be delay or red-tapism. As I said the problem is whether it is a proper thing for us to have one common Directorate for all the Government-owned industries including cottage industries or whether, as indicated by the Hon'ble Members Sri A. Bheemappa Naik, Sri A. G. Ramachandra Rao and Sri G. A. Acharya, we should have separate Boards constituted or whether the existing Boards should be reorganised and given more powers, more latitude, more autonomy—I do not mind using the word "autonomy." This is a matter on which the Government have to bestow a lot of consideration. The idea is that these industrial concerns must not be run as departments but more or less as

commercial concerns run by any private agency. With regard to the doubts my Hon'ble friend Sri Mascarenhas has raised, whether it is good to nationalise industries or promote nationalised industries, and whether Government industries can run as efficiently as private industries—these are matters on which I do not want to enter into a disputation at this stage. But I must refute the argument that Government-owned industries cannot be run as efficiently as private industries. The tendency even in England is to nationalise certain industries. Take the coal industry. Recently even when they came with only a small majority they have not abandoned it. I have looked into the matter. They have got separate Boards; they have their own Budget; but at the same time the Minister concerned is responsible for the working of those departments. If you want to hold the Minister responsible for the administration of the funds set apart for industries, you cannot tie his hands and feet down and say "you have no power to meddle with these industries" and yet make him responsible for these industries. But there is a way of striking a *via media*. Within certain known limits there must be ample powers and freedom not only in the matter of utilising the sanctioned amounts but also with matters such as the purchase of raw materials not necessarily going through the gamut of the Stores Purchase Committee. Everybody in the industrial concerns is agreed that it hampers a lot, to go through the Stores Purchase Committee. Then again in the matter of sales as well, there must be a certain amount of latitude. How best to reconcile these different views is a thing which the Government have been considering and I think this point having been brought so prominently before the House, would be very helpful to the Government in coming to a definite decision. My friend Sri Ramachandra Rao went a little out of the way to quote the Match Factory as an example. I wonder why he brought in that Match Factory into the bargain. That is a joint-stock concern in which the Government have

a limited interest and they have old antiquated machinery and you have got to contend against powerful Wimcos. Many private small concerns have floundered before this octopus—like Wimco. Even there we are trying our best to see that we do not undergo further losses. Every month we are undergoing losses and it is not fair that we should undergo further losses. It is on the advice of its Chairman, the Chief Conservator of Forests, that it is temporarily closed. How best to revive it is a thing we shall surely consider.

All that I say is, so far as the Mysore industrial set-up is concerned, even as the organization stands to-day, it is an example for the rest of India. Many people coming from outside and even the Fiscal Commission knew of the organization we had set up and I think everybody is satisfied that we are going about on right lines. With more autonomy and more powers, I think we will be able to solve the problem that is existing to-day so far as the management of these industries is concerned. I would like to conclude with this: the Government will take up for consideration the formation of the industrial directorate which has been recommended by the expert body with the idea of running the industrial concerns on commercial lines. With this explanation I think my Hon'ble friend will be satisfied and he will withdraw the resolution.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Sir, I seek permission to withdraw the resolution.

The resolution was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

NON-OFFICIAL BILL.

The Mysore Temple Entry Authorisation (Second Amendment) Bill, 1950.

Mr. SPEAKER (Sri V. Venkatappa).—Is the Hon'ble Member Sri Madiah going to move the Mysore Temple Entry Authorisation (Second Amendment) Bill tabled by him?

Sri M. MADIAH (Mysore District—Depressed Class).—Sir, I am not moving it.

POINT OF ORDER.

Point of Order whether the Legislative Assembly can discuss the State Government's recommendations regarding the orders passed by the Central Government.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು (ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ವೆಂಕಟಪ್ಪನವರು).—ಈಗ ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯಬಹುದೆಂದು ಸೂಚಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mushir-ul-Mulk J. MAHOMED IMAM (Chitaldrug *cum* Tumkur—Muslim).—Sir, I thank you very much for the opportunity you have given me and the members of this House to discuss fully a very important constitutional aspect that has been raised by the Leader of the House. Sir, as you have pointed out in your note, this is a very important question which affects the rights and privileges of this House and as such, it requires a thorough discussion and a thorough scrutiny and a dispassionate view from all the members of this House. So far as this question is concerned, it concerns the privileges and the powers of this House and our future powers and privileges depend upon the ruling to be given by you. The issue at first was a very simple one, but it has been complicated by the various points raised by the Leader of the House.

Sri K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY (Leader of the House).—For clarification.

Janab J. MAHOMED IMAM.—Not for clarification. I have gone through his speech. He has raised definite issues for decision, *viz.*, (1) How far this House can debate on the orders of the Government of India passed in the exercise of the powers conferred upon them and also on all their specific actions; (2) How far can this House debate on any of the specific actions of the Government of India which are based on the recommendation submitted to them by the Government of the State; and (3) To what extent can this House discuss the recommendation made by the State Government to the Government of India when this recommendation influences the orders passed

by them and when a definite action has been taken by the Government of India while passing this order. And again I am thankful to you for the note you have circulated among all the members of this House, which is of great help to us. So far as the recommendations are concerned.....

Janab MAHMOOD SHARIFF (Mysore *cum* Mandya *cum* Hassan—Muslim).—Which is the note the Hon'ble Member is referring to?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The statement that I made.

Janab MAHMOOD SHARIFF.—But it was not circulated.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Not to all.

Janab J. MAHOMED IMAM.—A statement was made by the Speaker. So far as the recommendations are concerned, you have classified them into three categories. So far as the orders of the Government of India are concerned, you have classified them into three categories. First, orders passed by the Government of India with the consent of the State Government; secondly, orders passed by the Government of India in consultation with the State Government; and thirdly, orders passed by the Government of India in cases where though there is no statutory or moral obligation to consult the State Government, still they consult the State Government or the State Government itself voluntarily or *suo moto* approaches the Central Government and offers its solution without being called for. These are the three categories and it is quite clear that these Government orders are based on the recommendations of the State Government. On these six points I would like to offer my views to the best of my ability.

Sir, I am thankful to you for the Note of yours, which deals with the extent of power of discussion and limitations if any. Sir, all our powers and privileges are guided by the Constitution, and all our debates and discussions are guided by the Constitution and by the Rules and Standing Orders. You have rightly pointed out that we are concerned here more with the limitations imposed on

us rather than the extent of powers that would be conferred. Sir, I humbly submit, powers are not conferred specifically on the members of this House. But there are limitations governing the conduct or the privileges of the Members, and there are some restrictions and in the absence of these limitations or restrictions on any point, it must be assumed the Members have privileges and powers to discuss on any matter. In the absence of limitations, the interpretation must be liberal and you, as the Speaker, should uphold the dignity and the privileges of this House, and it must be presumed that all the Members of this House have every privilege and have every right to discuss on any point that is brought on the floor of this House, unless there is something contrary to limit that discussion. Sir, in the whole of the Constitution and the Standing Orders and Rules, there are only two limitations on the scope of the discussion of the Members of this House. Under article 211, the limitation is:

"No discussion shall take place in the Legislature of a State with respect to the conduct of any Judge of the Supreme Court or of a High Court in the discharge of his duties."

That is the only limitation I find in the whole of the Constitution. There is no other limitation which restricts the scope of the Members to raise a discussion. Another limitation under Rule 28 is that while speaking, no Member should make a speech which will "reflect upon His Highness the Maharaja, the Members of the Ruling Family, the President" Apart from these two restrictions, I do not see any other restriction which will limit or curtail the powers and privileges of the Members of this House. So, this one point is quite enough for you to give a ruling in my favour and state that the Members of this House have got a right to debate on the orders passed by the Government of India or the recommendations of this Government.

On the other day, my Hon'ble friend was pleased to raise the question of Mir Laik Ali and the ruling given in that case by the Hon'ble Speaker

of the Parliament. Sir, I am afraid the Leader of the House has not gone fully into the ruling given by the Hon'ble Speaker of the Parliament

Sri K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—

I may at once say that the ruling was concerned more with the urgency of the matter than the constitutional aspect to which I referred. The ruling was to the effect that it was not an urgent matter which could be taken up during the session for discussion as a motion for adjournment.

Janab J. MAHOMED IMAM—I have got the extract of the speech made by the Hon'ble Leader of the House.

Sri K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—

I would like to modify; I wanted to say it myself.

Janab J. MAHOMED IMAM.—

Whether the ruling goes in my favour or not, the Speaker has definitely pointed out that so far as an adjournment motion is concerned, it is not the direct responsibility of the States Ministry, and hence cannot be allowed. But every Member is at perfect liberty and has a right to raise a debate in the Parliament in the form of questions or at the time of discussing demands. So, it is conceded that though the Central Legislature is not directly concerned with the administration of any State still on account of India being a whole they have got a right to raise a debate in the form of interpellations, resolutions and cut motions. *Vice versa*, we are taking the analogy of the States; whatever applies to the Centre, applies to the States also and according to the ruling given by the Speaker of the Central Assembly, we have every liberty. Every Member of this House has a right and power to raise a debate on the orders passed by the Government of India when it affects the State directly.

Sir, the Chief Minister on the other day made a distinction of subjects on which we can offer our views and those on which we cannot offer. He made a distinction of the orders of the Government of India which have been passed under specific provision in the Constitution and those orders which

have not been done in the exercise of the powers passed under any definite constitution which, can be debated upon. He also gave the illustration of purchase of food or allotment of food. He said, so far as allotment of food is concerned, it was not done by virtue of the powers conferred. I cannot agree to this. Whatever the States Ministry does, it is in the exercise of the powers conferred on them by the Constitution. So far as the allotment of food is concerned there may not be a separate provision or a separate section regulating the allotment as whatever they do, they do it as Ministers of States. They are Ministers of States by virtue of this Constitution, and exercise these powers and make necessary allotments. So, there is absolutely no distinction between the two cases. Whatever is done by the Government of India, whatever orders are passed by them, it is done in the exercise of powers conferred on them as Ministers by the Constitution. So, on these grounds I submit that this House has every power and we have every right to discuss the actions of the Government of India and their orders. There is no statutory limitations and in the absence of the statutory limitations, we must presume that we have got every power.

Now I come to the question whether this House has the power to raise a debate on the recommendations made by the State Government to the Government of India. The other day the Hon'ble Leader of the House divided the case very cleverly into two parts: advice and recommendation. He said that if a recommendation is submitted to the Rajpramukh it becomes advice, and if it is submitted to the Government of India, it remains as a recommendation. He also said that while the advice can be debated upon in this House, the recommendation cannot be debated upon. This is, I think, speculation, because it is not supported by any statutory provision. Recommendation is a recommendation, whatever may be its effect on the ultimate authority. I am not concerned with the influence it exercises on the Rajpramukh; I am not concerned with

what effect it has on the States Ministry; but I am concerned with your recommendation. That is all. The Hon'ble Minister said: "We have made our recommendation; it is left to the States Ministry as to what action they take; it does not come within our ministerial responsibility; it is none of our concern since it involves the ministerial responsibility of the Centre with which we are not concerned." I say I am not concerned with the ministerial responsibility of the Centre; but I am concerned with the ministerial responsibility of our own Ministry. Recommendation, whether it is submitted to the Rajpramukh or to the States Ministry, is a part of State administration. So, it comes within your ministerial responsibility. I am not concerned with its effect. Ministers are responsible to us, the Legislature. Whatever you do in the discharge of your duties as Ministers forms part of your administrative responsibility and therefore you are answerable to us in this House. Supposing a ruling is given that this recommendation should not be debated upon, then the Ministers will not be responsible to us and their action cannot be discussed in this House. Then, what is the position of this House? That is why I said that if we accept this position, we will be digging our own grave and depriving ourselves of all our powers. You have classified the recommendations into three categories. You have said: recommendation which is binding on the Centre and therefore we can debate; then, recommendation which is more or less in the form of opinion or consultation and there also we may debate and—the third category is very important—cases where there is no obligation on the part of the Government of India to consult this Government at all. No statutory obligation is laid there and the Centre does not consult us in such cases; the local Government voluntarily offers recommendation without any initiative from the Centre; the local Government sets the ball in motion or takes the initiative by offering recommendation or by sending a certain proposal to the Centre, on which the Government of India

takes direct action, being influenced by this recommendation. Can we debate upon such recommendation? I say that our duty is much more responsible in such a case than in the two previous cases, because at least in those two categories there are statutory provisions implying that consent should be obtained, etc. But here, you are making a recommendation to the States Ministry without being asked for, unwanted, uncalled for and unauthenticated. Here your responsibility is much more than in the other two cases. There is double responsibility, because your action is not supported by the constitution or by rules. In such cases, the Ministers cannot escape their responsibility saying that there is no statutory provision, that they made their recommendation and it was left to the Centre whether to accept it or not. They cannot take shelter under that. If they do it, there is no democratic form of Government; there is no responsible Government. It means that without consulting this House the local Government may send any recommendation to the Government of India and the Government of India which is not responsible to us may pass any order affecting the integrity, the finance or the welfare of the State. That is a dangerous position. In such circumstances, it will not be a responsible Government as my friend said. If such a contingency were to arise, it will be a bad day. So, there cannot be any difference in so far as recommendations made in all the three categories of cases. In all those cases, recommendation is one and the same. I am not concerned with its effect. But since recommendation forms part of the administrative matter, this House must have every right and privilege to debate on the recommendation. And the Government's duty is to place before this House their recommendations. Responsible Government has been established only of late, and all our conventions have to be built up; they have to be studied. I know that in the initial stages it will be very difficult. But it is in this stage that the greatest amount of care is required. We should not think

of doing anything which will damage or bring down the effective portion of the democratic system. That is why I am so particular about it. The Ministers say that they cannot lay before this House their recommendations. But I feel it is your duty to do so. It is not only you that administer the country, but we also have a hand and help you in administration. You are responsible to us for your omissions and commissions. When we ask for any information, it is your duty to lay before this House such information unless there is any statutory provision prohibiting it.

Sir, I want to answer the two questions raised by you the other day. You said, Sir, what is the effect on the finality of the orders of the Government of India if this resolution is passed. Secondly, you have raised another pertinent question. What will be the effect if the recommendation goes from the Rajpramukh, for which there is provision statutorily. Sir, so far as I am concerned, there will not be any radical change on the finality of the orders of the Government of India. For example, take this case of Sri Puttaraj Urs. I am not entering into the merits of the question, because you have asked me not to do so. On the recommendation of the Chief Justice which was strongly backed up by the State Government, as was disclosed by Sardar Patel, the States Ministry and the President have taken a certain action, and I presume it is your earnest desire to know what the effect will be in the future. Sir, the State Government made certain recommendations, which the President is either bound to accept or not.

Sri H. C. DASAPPA (Minister for Finance and Industries).—May accept or may not.

Janab J. MAHOMED IMAM.—In this particular case he did accept the recommendation.

Sri K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—We are not discussing this particular case.

Janab J. MAHOMED IMAM.—I am not going to discuss this case. In this instance the President accepted the recommendation of the Government. Now the question is—what will be the

effect of our views and whether it will be possible for him to change it or not? The President took into consideration the recommendations from the local Government on the assumption that they represented the people and that they reflected the views of this House. Because, he assumes that whatever recommendations this Government makes, will be taken by the Centre on the assumption that the recommendations are backed by the Members of this House. Supposing, in the course of this debate, we indicate to them that the action of the Ministry is not backed by the members of this House...

Mr. SPEAKER.—Not in the course of the discussion on the resolution or in the decision you take?

Janab J. MAHOMED IMAM.—Supposing this Assembly gives a verdict which is quite different from the action taken, then I think, the President has every right to take the opinion of this House and modify the order as circumstances permit and according to rules. As I said already, the recommendations of this House will have an influence on the President either to confirm his order, rescind or modify.

The other point you raised Sir, was, what would be the consequences if a recommendation goes from the person who is bound to make such a recommendation. Of course on this point, the Chief Minister has not clarified. He said that he would like to have some time before he could give his views. In my opinion it does not make any difference. The recommendations in any case, let it be by anybody even by a local body, will have the same effect. But it will not be beyond the jurisdiction of this House.

Sir, I have said enough on the constitutional aspect. I am very much concerned, as I said before, with the powers and privileges of this House. This is a vital matter and an important issue; it requires your careful scrutiny. You are the upholder of the privileges of this House. As I submitted, the privileges of this House should not be curtailed unless there is statutory provision for that or unless there are precedents. Precedents are built

up by the Speakers. You have the honour of being the first Speaker and you will be the predecessor to all Speakers to come. I am quite certain that you will give guidance, give a ruling which will be followed as a glorious precedent in the history of the constitution of Mysore by all the Speakers that will come hereafter.

What I feel is this. This is a case where we are curtailing our powers by ourselves. It is this attitude that makes me sad. If it is due to the exigencies of some other case, it would not have mattered. But now in a calmer moment, if all the members will reflect, if the Treasury Benches will reflect over this—because they are patriots—I do think that they do not want to curtail the powers and privileges of this House. They have to take a definite stand in this case. I am quite confident that they are second to none in upholding the powers and privileges of this House, and I am sure they will adopt a course which will enhance the powers and privileges of this House.

Sri K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have not risen now to speak on the point of order on its merits. I have just risen to make a personal statement. I was very glad that my friend Hon'ble Janab Imam said towards the end of his speech that even we are not actuated by any desire to curtail the powers and privileges of this House. That goes without saying. That is the correct position. I am thankful to my Hon'ble friend Janab Imam for having made that statement. In fact, even before he made that statement I wanted to rise and explain the position clearly. We along with other Hon'ble Members of this House are very anxious that we should do nothing to curtail either the privileges or the powers of this House. We are laying down the position for a pretty long time. I do not want any ruling or decision to be taken in a hurry which would have the effect of curtailing the powers and privileges of this House. I have absolutely no doubt in the matter. All of us should endeavour to maintain unimpaired and undiluted the powers and privileges of

this House. If I have raised this point of order, it is not, Sir, with a view to curtail the powers and privileges of this House, nor to evade responsibility to any degree whatsoever.

The Ministry takes the responsibility for any act done by it whether of commission or omission. We do not want to avoid discussion, generally speaking, regarding any matter which involves that responsibility. I also indicated that when I raised this point of order. Even on the particular instance in which the point of order has been raised, we would have welcomed discussion on the merits. We would have an opportunity to say what should have been said in the matter and it would have given us a pleasure to do so. So these two points I wanted to make clear.

Regarding the merits of the point of order, as already pointed out by the Chair and the Leader of the Opposition, it is a very interesting point of order. We have got to lay down the correct spheres of the debate on one side connected with the State Legislatures and on the other side with the Central Legislature indirectly so far as we are concerned. It is for the Central Legislature to lay down the spheres of debate in the Indian Parliament. At present the matter is one of constitutional importance. To me as I said it is a very interesting and somewhat complicated matter. The Hon'ble the Leader of the Opposition said that I had raised complications. I have raised certain complications because the situation is complicated. My anxiety is to have all the points clarified so that we may know where we stand.

Regarding the merits of the point of order I seek the permission of the Chair to say something later on in the course of the debate.

*Janab MAHMOOD SHARIFF (Mysore *cum* Mandya *cum* Hassan—Muslim).—One information I would like to secure is on a thing that is going to have a bearing on the course of discussion. It is this. Sardar Patel while he made a statement on the floor of the Parliament said that the whole matter has been referred to the Chief

Justice of India. In pursuance of that, the Chief Justice of India is coming over here to hold an enquiry. We read in the papers that pending that the particular gentleman who has been retired has been given his salary and all those things. If the Chief Justice is coming over here and if he is going to hold an enquiry and this matter is going to come during the course of the enquiry, supposing we discuss the whole thing.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—We are not going to discuss that point at all.

Janab MAHMOOD SHARIFF.—... .. will we not be placing the Government in some delicate position?

Mr. SPEAKER.—No. We are not discussing that point. We are discussing only the general points.

Janab MAHMOOD SHARIFF.—In any case if that information is given the course of discussion may be curtailed.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಮೊದಲೇ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡುವುದು ಬೇಡ. ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ನರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೂ ನಮಗೂ ಒಪ್ಪಂದ ನಡೆಯತಕ್ಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಅಂಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಬರುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಆ ಅಂಶಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿದಾರೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಈ ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧವು, ಅಂಶ ಏನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ.

Janab MAHMOOD SHARIFF.—If that is so, the information I am asking for with regard to the point raised by the Hon'ble Member Janab Mahomed Imam is whether this Legislature is competent to discuss this aspect of the question.

*Sri T. SUBRAMANYA (Tumkur District—General).—I have a suggestion to make. The Speaker has now been asked to give a ruling upon a point of order which covers the entire Constitution as it were. Instead of asking him to interpret the entire Constitution which is the business of a jurist, I would like to suggest that a ruling be given on specific issues as and when points are raised on the floor of the House. Now this matter arose because of two issues; one was with reference to the recommendation made by the Government or by the Minister concerned.....

Sri K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—By the Government; joint responsibility.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—.....by the Government to the States Ministry with regard to the fixing of the term of office of Sri R. Puttaraj Urs. Since the matter is not going to be discussed now, it is not necessary to consider the question whether any order of the Government of India can be discussed on the floor of the House. Such contingency may or may not arise and it is not wisdom to give a ruling for all contingencies.

Janab J. MAHOMED IMAM.—I am not at all anxious about Sri R. Puttaraj Urs. But I am anxious about similar cases in future, for which a ruling may be given for being followed from the next session.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—I am suggesting this method because similar occasions may or may not arise. If they arise, wisdom lays down that we should discuss them when the situation arises and request the Chair to give a ruling on that point instead of imagining things and asking for a ruling. That is why I submit that whether any particular order of the Government of India could be debated upon or not or whether any constitutional provision has been for consultation with the Government of Mysore and whether in pursuance of such consultation they have given their opinion or whether the President is bound to consult in cases where he is not bound to consult us or *suo moto* Mysore Government makes a recommendation and whether such recommendation could be discussed all these are points to be decided when those questions arise. Now that we have said that Sri Puttaraj Urs's episode is not to be discussed here because of propriety, these questions need not be referred to the Chair for a ruling at this stage. The whole thing may be postponed and a ruling sought for as and when occasion arises. That is my point and that is the best thing. Because, interpretation of the various sections of the Constitution will have to be done by the Chair which I submit is the work of a court, a jurist. I therefore request the Leader of the House as also the Leader of the Opposition to accept this proposition that we

will discuss it as and when occasion arises.

Sri K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—Even if the Chair is called upon to give a ruling on this specific instance, the ruling cannot be given unless the general position is clarified. On the general aspect a ruling has to be given. That cannot be avoided.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—I therefore say that we can examine the whole question when the occasion arises. Occasion has not arisen now. The Chair said the other day that the matter was being taken cognisance of by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and it was not proper for us to go into the matter. Only a general discussion was allowed. At the same time the Chair said that it was not proper for us to give that advice. We accepted it. Therefore the occasion has passed. When a fresh occasion arises we will try and canvas opinion and then go on.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That point may be considered and if they do not want my ruling.....

Sri K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—At the end of this, the Chair can give a ruling to the effect that a ruling will be given.....(Laughter).

***Sri M. GOVINDA REDDY** (Chitaldrug District-General).—Will the Hon'ble Leader point out whether general constitutional powers in the particular position, in regard to powers of this House *vis-a-vis* the Centre, is a relevant factor in considering the matter which has arisen for giving a ruling? The point which has invited the ruling is whether this House can raise a debate on the recommendation of the Government of Mysore. In giving a ruling on this subject it is very necessary to refer to the powers of this House and the relation between the Government and this House and the head of the executive of the State and the head of the executive of the Union. Simply because it has to refer to these points, it does not mean that the Chair is invited to give a ruling on every point. The ruling will be only on one point, whether the recommendation of this Government could raise a debate here. That is the only point which invites a ruling

though other points will be referred to in order to elucidate the information that is required on that particular point. Therefore, I submit that it is not necessary for the Chair to give a ruling on other points except that point and therefore there is nothing preventing the whole question being discussed in this House.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡರು (ತ:ಮಕೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ).—ನಾನೂ ಕೂಡ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಗೋವಿಂದ ರೆಡ್ಡಿಯವರು ತಿಳಿಸಿರುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನೇ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕ್ರಿಯಾ ರೋಪವೇಳತಕ್ಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಅದು ಎಷ್ಟರ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಗೆ ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಮತ್ತು ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಹಕ್ಕಿಗೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬ ವಿಚಾರ ದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಸಲು ನಮಗೆ ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಲೇ ಬೇಕು. ಹೀಗೆ ನಮಗೆ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಬೇಕೆ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇಡವೇ ಎಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಆಗಾಗ್ಗೆ ನಾವು ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಂಥಾ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳು ಎಷ್ಟೇ ಬರಬಹುದು. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಬೇಕೇ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇಡವೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಈಗಲೇ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಿ ನಿಷ್ಕರ್ಷೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಉತ್ತಮವಾದುದೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಗೋವಿಂದ ರೆಡ್ಡಿಯವರು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವುದು ನಿಜವು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೂ ಸಾರವಾಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ನಿಜವು ಹೇಳಿದ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

*Janab MOHAMED VALIULLA (Kolar—Muslim).—On that I have got one word. Supposing your ruling is that there is no force in the point of order raised by the Leader of the House. Then we cannot discuss the cut motion moved by Janab Imam because the Budget is already passed. Even if you rule that it has no force, we cannot discuss the point because the question automatically drops. Therefore what is the use in getting an opinion for further action? We are not here as constitutional experts or lawyers to give an opinion. You have got to give a ruling when the question arises.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಾನು ಆ ಬೋಧನಾ ಸೂಚನೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಆಗಲೇ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಆ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಂಥಾ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶಗಳೇನಾದರೂ ಬಂದಿದರೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈಗ general ಆಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ ಅಷ್ಟೆ.

Janab MOHAMED VALIULLA.—We are not lawyers to give an opinion.

Janab J. MAHOMED IMAM.—They are prescribing the duties of the Speaker. They ought not to. They cannot say that the Speaker should give

a ruling. You have got an inherent right to do as you please. I think my friend should not infringe on the right of the Speaker.

Janab MOHAMED VALIULLA.—You can give a ruling when it is necessary. There is force in what Sri Subramanya has stated. We cannot sit here as constitutional experts to give opinion on all points that may be raised in future. I support Sri Subramanya's point of view and it is better to postpone it and argue it again when the question arises.

*Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Chitaldrug District—General).—This point of order arose when Janab Imam moved a cut motion with regard to a particular point. As you were pleased to observe, the subject-matter of that cut motion cannot be discussed now for the simple reason that the Supreme Court of India is seized of that matter now. When that cannot be the subject-matter of discussion here, I cannot understand how we can discuss about the point of order. You are aware that under Rule 29 a point of order arises over a particular point. Now the point itself is absent. I do not think any useful purpose will be served by discussing about it.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಭಾನಾಯಕರು ತಿಳಿಸಿರುವುದನ್ನು ತಾವು ಮರೆತುಬಿಟ್ಟಿರುವಹಾಗಿದೆ. ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಂಥಾ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳು ಒಂದಿಗಿಂತ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು general ಆಗಿ ಒಂದು ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯಬಹುದೆಂದು ಅವರು ಒಂದು ಸೂಚನೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈಗ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಯಾರೂ ಈಗ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ರೂಲಿಂಗನ್ನು ಆಗಲೇ ಕೊಟ್ಟಾಗಿದೆ. ಆ ರೂಲಿಂಗಿಗೂ ಈಗ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೂ ಯಾವ ಸಂಬಂಧವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ.

*Sri M. GOVINDA REDDY.—There are two different things. The merit of the cut motion is a different thing. Whether the Hon'ble mover can raise a debate on the floor of this House on that is a different thing. There are two different things. As the Chair has observed, we are not going into the merits of the recommendation; we are now going to debate upon whether the Hon'ble mover of the cut motion could raise a debate on that point. That is all.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Any discussion will be a matter of debate.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is not the point. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಶಿಪಾರನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳು ಅನೇಕವಾಗಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುವ ಶಿಪಾರನ್ನುಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಸಲು ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆಯೇ, ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬುದೇ ಈಗ ಉದ್ಭವಿಸಿರುವ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಸುಬ್ರಹ್ಮಣ್ಯರವರು.—ಈಗ ಈ ಕ್ರಿಯಾ ಲೋಪವು ಯಾವ ವಿಷಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಎದ್ದಿರುತ್ತದೆಯೋ, ಆ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲ ನಾವು ಕೈ ಹಾಕುವಂತಿಲ್ಲ. ಮುಂದೇ ನಾದರೂ ಇಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳು ಒದಗಿದರೆ ಆಗ ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯವರು ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಸಬಹುದೆಂಬ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಈಗ ಉಂಟಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂಥಾ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳು ಒದಗಿದಾಗ ಅದರ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದುದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡರು.—ಮೊದಲು ಇವರು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದರೂ, ಈಗ ಅವರೇ ಅದನ್ನು ಡೆಫರ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅವರು ಹಾಗೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಡೆಫರ್ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ.

***Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO** (Hassan District—General).—Sir, the Chair has been pleased to direct a discussion and also the Chair issued a note for the purpose of discussion. Whether we could discuss the special issue which has become so large and so big, is the question. The original issue which gave rise to this proposition having been detached, having been so isolated that it cannot at all be discussed in any manner, led to this subsidiary issue whether it can be discussed. The issue in itself is so big as to involve a discussion about the full gamut of the administration and the liberty of the subjects. It has no immediate practical value. It only becomes a matter of academic interest. I want the House to consider whether an independent motion for discussion on a subject of academic interest could be brought before this House. I am sure under the rules no such independent motion could be brought up before this House. I want the House to consider whether this method of raising an issue from which this bigger question arises and then putting aside the original issue and taking up discussion on the other issue would be proper and whether to indulge in such a discussion would be proper. My submission is that the

discussion on this subject having become so academic as to have no practical or immediate utility ought not to be indulged in by this House.

Rajamantrapravina H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA (Hassan District—General).—I think in the course of the discussion on the point of order as I understand it to be, it has developed itself into a general discussion. A point of order is a specific point on which the Chair has to give a ruling. Now I find both from the Hon'ble Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition that the main issue, viz. the recommendation made by this Government to the Centre has ceased to be of any interest at all. The Hon'ble Leader of the House suggested that since it has been referred by the State's Ministry to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, there is no propriety in pursuing the discussion. To that the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition readily agreed and in response to the suggestion offered by the Chair, the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition did not choose to press the matter. Now so far as that point of order is concerned, it has gone. There are the subsidiary things. Now we are in possession of those matters. Well, Sir, my feeling is, are we going to discuss these matters and supposing we discuss threadbare, is the Hon'ble the Speaker of the House going to give a ruling? What is the occasion to give a ruling on the matter I would like to know. Supposing this Hon'ble House discusses in detail all these points—no doubt they are very important points—is the Hon'ble Speaker of the House going to give a ruling on this matter? There are no issues. I say it is irrelevant in the sense, that the main issue is gone. Where is the necessity to go into these matters now?

Sri M. GOVINDA REDDY.—Is the issue gone?

Sri H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA.—I say definitely, the issue is gone. I was under the impression that I would be going to offer some remarks on the point of order raised by the Leader of the House. But I cannot proceed on that matter now. Before the question is

decided, is this the occasion to carry on discussion on such matters? A point of order gene rally requires a ruling of the Chair, where a specific matter is raised and a doubt is expressed by the different sections of the House. But now, the issue is no longer there. Instead of spending our time on that, there is occasion to give ruling on different issues. I see now nothing to continue the discussion, though no doubt the points referred to by the Hon'ble Speaker are very important. I feel now that it is a matter which virtually goes and the Chair cannot give a ruling at all. Instead of spending any more of the time on this matter, we can as well say, there is no point of order, and further discussion can be stopped. That is all I can say.

Janab J. MAHOMED IMAM.—If you permit me, I would just like to read a relevant portion of the ruling you gave the other day.

ಅಂದು ನೀವು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ :

“ ಇಂದಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಫೆಡರಲ್ ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನ ಜಡ್ಜಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ನಾವೇನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಅದರಿಂದ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗಬಹುದು. ಯಾರಿಗಾದರೂ ಹೀಗೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುವುದಾದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ತಪ್ಪಿಸುವುದು ನಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ತಾವು ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರವೇಶಿಸಬಾರದೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡೆ. ಅದರಂತೆ ಅವರು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಮನ್ನಣೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಆ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದೇ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಸಭಾನಾಯಕರು ಯಾವ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅವನ್ನು ವಿಮರ್ಶಮಾಡಿ ಒಂದು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿದೆ ”

ಎಂದು, ಆದರೆ, ಈಗ ನನ್ನ ಮಿತ್ರರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆಂದರೆ “since I withdrew my cut motion.....”

Sri H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA.—Not a ruling; it is an observation.

Janab J. MAHOMED IMAM.—They are stating that since I withdrew that cut motion, there is nothing to pursue further. Sir, you know and the House is aware of the circumstances under which I withdrew the cut motion. Because, it was partly due to the fact that the Chair asked me not to embarrass the enquiry by pressing this motion. Secondly, an assurance was given by the Chair and also the Leader of the House that apart from that, this question as to how far this House can debate would be taken independently

and considered and you also promised to give a ruling on that.

Sri H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA.—On what?

Janab J. MAHOMED IMAM.—On the question regarding powers and privileges of this House to debate on the orders of the Government of India.....

A VOICE.—Or the recommendation of this Government.

Janab J. MAHOMED IMAM.....or the recommendation of this Government and also the orders of the Government of India. So, you said you would take it up as a different issue. I am not particular about that; I am not particular about the general powers of this House. I may take a relevant portion from the speech of the Leader of the House :

“ Sir, I think that a time has come when you have got to take this up in right earnest... ..”

ಅದೃಷ್ಟರೂ.—ಅವರು ಈಗಲೂ ಹೇಳಿದರಲ್ಲಾ !

ಜನಾಬ್ ಜಿ. ಮಹಮದ್ ಇಮಾಂರವರು.—ಹೌದು ಹೇಳಿದರು.

ಅದೃಷ್ಟರೂ.—ಈಗ ಆ general points ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಿ ಒಂದು decision ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಅಥವಾ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕವೆಂದು ಸಭೆಯವರು ಭಾವಿಸುವುದಾದರೆ, ನಾನೇನೂ ruling ಕೊಡಲು ಆಶಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

Janab J. MAHOMED IMAM.—And for this, two days were set apart by the Speaker, and all the House agreed to raise these points knowing fully well the circumstances. Now, to go back and take the advantage of my having withdrawn the cut motion, does not look fair. I leave it to you, Sir.

Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—Sir, quite apart from the question of discussing the point of order that has been raised, another virtual point of order on this question of point of order has been raised to the effect, whether it would be a correct thing or a wise thing for us to take up a question of point of order when the very subject matter on which it was raised is no longer before this House. I think that is the point raised by Sri T. Subramanya.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House made that point clear that day alone.

Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—My own view is this. That day, my Hon'ble friend, the Leader of the Opposition raised this

point under the cut motion. Virtually, there were two points of order, one raised by the Leader of the House to the effect that no recommendation to the Centre on a matter for which this Government cannot be held responsible to the Legislature can form the subject matter of a motion or a debate in this House—that was the main point that was raised by the Leader of the House and there was another point of order namely, when the matter had been referred to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, it was not proper that there should be any discussion whatsoever on that point. Thus there were two points of order virtually. Now, the motion can be neutralised by any one of the points of order. It is not necessary that all the points of order must go against the mover of the motion. On one point of order alone, namely, that the matter was virtually more or less *sub judice*, it was considered not desirable that the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition should proceed with his motion.

But, there was at the same time the other point of order on the general issue, *viz.*, whether any recommendation of this Government in matters relating exclusively to those of the Centre, can be discussed on the floor of this House and whether the proper forum for this would not be the Indian Parliament and not this House. Sir, on that point I am afraid I feel at variance with my Hon'ble friend Sri T. Subramanya and Janab Valliulla, because this is how Rule 29 which relates to the point of order, on page 10 of the Rules and Standing Orders, reads :

"29. (1) The Speaker shall decide all points of order which may arise, and his decision shall be final.

(2) Any member may at any time submit a point of order for the decision of the Speaker, but in doing so, shall confine himself to stating the point."

I have tried to see whether anywhere in these Rules there is a restriction placed on the matter of discussing a point of order to the effect that a point of order that has been raised must be discussed and decided with reference to that particular motion. I think the powers of this House are not

so restricted and limited as to say that a point of order once raised should be exclusively limited to the particular motion before the House. In such cases it must be open to this House to have a ruling on that matter because the same point of order may have to be raised in connection with other motions of a similar character. In view of the fact that there is no restriction whatever on this matter, I think, it would be well within the powers of this House—I am not referring to the wisdom or the expediency of the matter at all, but I am only referring to the question of right—to discuss the point of order and to come to a decision on that point.

If this is decided, I would like to go to the merits of the points raised by Janab Imam.

*Janab MOHAMED HANIEF (Bangalore—Muslim).—The fact that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court has been entrusted with the enquiry into the incident is relevant to the point at issue. It will be very awkward, for the person concerned if this House should take up this question and go into it in order to find out whether our privileges have been transgressed.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—Are we canvassing any opinion in favour or against?

Janab MOHAMED HANIEF.—I am not doing that at all. But what I am saying is that by the way in which we are discussing the matter, by this loose talking, such an awkward situation can be created. Therefore, greater is the reason for us to avoid all such discussion in view of the fact that there is an endeavour on the part of the States Ministry to enquire into the case and do justice to the person concerned. There is no need for us to discuss that matter here. (*A Voice: We are not discussing that point.*) with a view to find out whether that order or the recommendation of our Government is not going to curtail the scope of our privileges and rights. (*Interruption*) A point of order was raised that this House cannot go into the recommendations made by our Ministry to the States Ministry with regard to this case, for our recommendations cannot become the subject matter of discussion in this

House as they do not concern with any matter about which this House is really exercising any power.

Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—This does not relate to any particular instance.

Janab MAHOMED HANIEF.—The other view is that the recommendation of this Ministry can become the subject-matter of discussion in this House, because the Ministry is our representative and any action of theirs can be called into question and an opinion given on the action that the Ministry has taken irrespective of the fact whether that has or has not effect on the Centre. That is the subject-matter of the point of order now raised. I believe it is so. Even in regard to that, what I say is, while discussing this question, there is a likelihood of our getting into those fields which it may not be desirable for us to enter, because they are in relation to a person who is greatly affected by any kind of debate on the floor of this House. Therefore

Mr. SPEAKER.—We are not going to discuss about that matter at all.

Janab MOHAMED HANIEF.—It comes incidental to the discussion which is going to begin in this House. I do not know whether I have made myself clear on the point that has been raised. Can we or can we not call upon our Ministry to place before us their recommendation? Because they are recommendations made by them to the Central Ministry and they are our representatives, they are bound to place those recommendations before the House. That is our privilege. And in not placing their recommendation before the House, are they not transgressing that privilege? That is the point at issue. That is how I understand. We will certainly be getting into the merits of the case directly or indirectly if we take up the question. Therefore my anxiety is only this: the question must be shelved in view of the fact that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court has been entrusted with the matter. Until he gives a decision upon it, it may not be desirable for us to discuss this matter. Therefore we can as well close the discussion till the decision of the

Chief Justice of the Supreme Court is published.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿ. ಲಿಂಗಾರೆಡ್ಡಿಯವರು (ಕೋಲಾರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ).—ಈ ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪದ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಕಾರಣವಿದೆ. ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಸುಬ್ರಹ್ಮಣ್ಯರವರು ಎತ್ತಿರುವ ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪ ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದುದು. ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿರುವ ವಿಷಯವೂ ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಕಾರಣವೇನೆಂದರೆ ನಾವು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪದ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಬೇಕೆ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇಡವೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ಸುಲಭವಾಗಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಕೋರಡನ ಜನಾಬ್ ಇಮಾಂರವರು ಕತ್ತರಿ ಪ್ರಯೋಗ ತಂದ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ಆಗಲೇ ಒಂದು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ: ಆ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ನಾಯಕರೂ ಮತ್ತು ತಾವೂ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾಸಂಗಿಕವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಅದೇ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಒಂದು ದಿವಸ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಬಹುದೆಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಾಯಕರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅಂಥ ಅನೇಕ ವಿಷಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಮಗೆ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ಒಂದು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಇರುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಂದರೆ ತಾವು ಒಂದು ಸೂಚನೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಅಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕಿರುವ ಕಷ್ಟವನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆ, ಬೇಡವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪದ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಕೂಡದೆಂದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಏನು ರೈಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಒಂದು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನೇಕೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿ. ದಾಸಪ್ಪನವರು.—ಅದರ ಬಿಸಿತ್ತು. ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿ. ಲಿಂಗಾರೆಡ್ಡಿಯವರು.—ಈ ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ ಹಕ್ಕಿದೆ, ನಾವು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿ. ದಾಸಪ್ಪನವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನೂ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನವರು ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲ point at issue ಮೇಲೆ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿ ಬಾಕಿ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದಿರಬಹುದು. ಅಂದ ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಅವುಗಳೆಲ್ಲವೂ ಕೂಡ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ವಿಷಯಗಳಿವೆ, ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಶಾಸನ ವಿಧಾಯಕ ಸಭೆ ಕೋರ್ಟು ಕಛೇರಿ ವಿವರಣೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಅವುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಅಕಡೆಮಿಕ್ ಇಂಟರೆಸ್ಟ್ ನಿಂದ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಜನಾಬ್ ಇಮಾಂರವರ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಇಷ್ಟು ಮೇಲೆ ಒಂದು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಮೇಲೆ ಸಬ್ ಸಿಡಿಯರಿ ಇಮ್ಯೂನ್ ನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ, ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕ ಎಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri M. GOVINDA REDDY.—Sir, I seek information from the Chair. Was a ruling given by the Chair on the point of order raised by the

Hon'ble Leader of the House on the cut motion? Because I see there is some confusion on the points of order, the position. I am seeking this clarification so that the Position may be clear, as to whether a ruling was given by the Chair on the point of order raised on the cut motion.

Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—It is not. It is just that that is being discussed now.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ತಾನೇ ಅದನ್ನು ಜನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಸಾಹೇಬರು ಓದಿ ಹೇಳಿದರು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಗೋವಿಂದ ರೆಡ್ಡಿಯವರು.—ವಾಚನಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ, ಅದು ರೂಲಿಗೆ ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ಒಂದು sub-judice ಆಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಅದನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಿದರೆ embarrass ಆಗುವುದರಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನು ವಾಚನಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಸಭಾನಾಯಕರು ಎಂತೆಂಥಾ ಆಡಳಿತ ಗಳನ್ನು ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೆಂಬ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚಿಸಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು general ಆಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದೆ.

Sri. H. M. CHANNABASAPPA (Mysore District—General).—Sir, I would like to add a few words to the debate that has taken place. Under the new set-up we have so many things in common between the Government of India and the Government of Mysore. The Government of India will have occasion to come to certain decisions on matters pertaining to the State. In coming to those decisions, the State Government will have their own part. As we all know, freedom of speech and expression is one of the fundamental rights that people enjoy under the new Constitution. On the omissions and the commissions of the State and the Central Governments, people have the right of expressing their opinion subject to the restrictions provided therefor. Particularly now when the vital interests of the people of the State are to a very great extent dependent on the decisions taken by the Government of India, I see no reason why a statutory body like the House of Legislature should not raise a debate on the omissions or commissions of the State Government, in the affairs pertaining to them. The present issue has arisen out of the decision taken by the Government of

India on the recommendations of the State Government. If the right of debate on such matters is curtailed, it will mean curtailment of one of the fundamental privileges of this House. We will not be in a position to ventilate what we feel about the omissions or commissions of Government so far as it pertains to the interests of the people of our State. If a ruling is given to the effect that this House should not debate on the decision taken by the Government of India, then a very valuable privilege of the members of this House will be curtailed. We may not take a decision on what the Government of India have done; but, to raise a debate on the subject and express what we feel, is a fundamental right conferred by the Constitution of India. I naturally feel that we should enjoy this privilege of raising debates on all matters, whether it be the commissions or omissions of the State Government or the Government of India, so long as it pertains to the well-being of the people of the State. Of course, as already pointed out, we may not be in a position to take a decision on the decision already taken by the Government of India. The discussions made on the floor of this House will go a long way to influence the actions of the Government of India with respect to our interests.

There is another point that should be considered. I feel like referring this question to the Privileges Committee to examine the scope and extent of the debate to which this House can go with respect to the omissions or commissions of the Government of India and the Government of Mysore, subject to the limitations prescribed in the Constitution. Because, any ruling given may affect the privileges of this House. It is on this ground, that I feel like referring this question to the Privileges Committee for consideration. If that is not possible I should like to add that it is within the privileges of this House to consider the question of the omissions or commissions of the State Government on all matters pertaining to the well-being of the State.

Sri M. N. JOIS (Mysore District—General).—Sir, in the List of Business supplied to us, it is stated that discussion on the point of order is reserved to be debated to-day. Till now I was under the impression that the point of order referred to the subject matter raised by Janab Mahomed Imam. Now the Hon'ble Chair has been pleased to say that a ruling on the point of order on the subject has already been given. When the subject on which a ruling is sought is not there, there can be only a discussion of a desultory nature.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನನ್ನ ನಾನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ತಾವು ಹೇಳುವ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಬಹುಶಃ ನಾನು ಆ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಾಗ ತಾವು ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ರೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri M. N. JOIS.—I am not accusing the Chair. I will take the blame on myself that I understood like that. The Hon'ble Finance Minister has raised a point that there is a different point of order. When that is so, that particular point of order cannot come up in that fashion. If he wanted to discuss something of a general nature as has been envisaged by the Hon'ble Leader of the party, he ought to have done so by means of a specific motion. In the absence of any such specific motion, I think it will not be quite proper for us to discuss that subject matter.

Again, Sir, the Hon'ble Member Channabasappa said that this may go to Privileges Committee. I feel that this is more a constitutional issue rather than a privilege issue. Under these circumstances, I feel that there is no necessity to refer this subject to the Privileges Committee or to discuss anything about this point of order. At the same time, I am sure and I believe that this House has every right to discuss such a point of order, but the method in which it has been brought is not quite in order. As such it may not be discussed. That is my view.

Sri H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA.—So far as the point of order is concerned, the ruling is there. The Chair is at liberty to take up any matter for discussion or reserve anything for ruling. The Chair is at liberty to request the

Members to give their considered opinion. Now in view of this ruling so far as the point of order is concerned it is disposed of. Regarding the questions that have arisen in consequence of that point of order raised, it is perfectly open for the Chair, for purposes of clarification, to allow discussion on those points, and to give a ruling on those points.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಮಾದಯ್ಯನವರು (ಮೈಸೂರು—ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ—ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪಂಗಡ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸುಬ್ಬಹ್ನಿರವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಸಮರ್ಥಿಸುತ್ತಾ, ತಾವು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸೂಚನೆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಡದೇ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಪ್ರವೇಶಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿದರೆ ಅವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸೂಚನೆ ಬಹಳ ಸಾಧುವಾಗಿದೆ ಮತ್ತು ನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಕಾರಣವೇನೆಂದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನೇಕರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ಅದನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕವೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಮಾದಯ್ಯನವರು.—ನಾನು ಅದರ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದು ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇದ್ದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಯಾವ ರೂಲಿಂಗೂ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವವರಲ್ಲ ನಾನೊಬ್ಬ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಗುಂಡಪ್ಪಗೌಡರು ಆಗರೇ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟದ್ದಲ್ಲ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಕೆಲವು ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಸಭಾ ನಾಯಕರು ಎತ್ತಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಭೆಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ಏನಾದರೂ ಹೇಳುವುದಿದ್ದರೆ ಹೇಳಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಮಾದಯ್ಯನವರು.—ನಾನೂ ಅದೇ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೆ. ನನಗೆ ಅನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ, ತಾವು ಯಾವ ವಿಧವಾದ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವುದೂ ಯುಕ್ತವಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ನ್ಯಾಯವಲ್ಲ. ನನ್ನ ಕಾರಣ ಇಷ್ಟೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ಸ್ಟಾಂಡಿಂಗ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ಸ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಕಾನ್ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಸಹ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ.

ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಬಂದಾಗ ಅದು ಸರಿ ಯಾಗಿದೆಯೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಆಯಾ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ತಮ್ಮ ಹಕ್ಕು ಮತ್ತು ಅಧಿಕಾರವಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಇಂಥಾ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು.....

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ಆ ಅಂತ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಆಗಿದೆ. ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೇ ಅಥವಾ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಯಾವುದನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಮಾದಯ್ಯನವರು.—ಅದನ್ನೇ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೆ. ಮೊನ್ನೆ ಹೇಳಿದಾಗ ಮೂರು ಪಂಗಡದ ವಿಷಯ

ಗೇಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲನೇ ಎರಡರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರೂ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಕೊನೇ ಪಂಗಡಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದ್ದರ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವರು (unseen hand) ಒಳಗೇ ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒಳಗೆ ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಯುವ (ಅಂದರೆ ರಹಸ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಸಲಹೆಕೊಡುವ) ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಯುಕ್ತವೇ ಅಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬುದು ಒಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದದ್ದು. ಆ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಏನೇ ಇದ್ದರೂ ಸಹ ನನಗೆ ಅನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಳುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಭಾವನೆ. ಕಾರಣವೇನೆಂದರೆ ತಾವು ಈಗಲೇ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತರುವಾಗ ಈಗ ಕೊಡಬಹುದಾದ ರೂಲಿಂಗಿಗೆ ಅನುಗುಣವಾಗಿ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮುಂದೆ ಆ ವಿಷಯ ಬಂದಾಗ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಆ ಪಂಗಡಕ್ಕೆ ಎಂದರೆ "unseen hand" ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಯುವ ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅದು ಯಾವುದು ಏನು ಎಂಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರುವಾಗ ತಾವು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯವಲ್ಲ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ಇರುವ ಚರ್ಚೆ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಮಾದಯ್ಯನವರು.—ಸಾಧುವೇ, ಅಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ, ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಮತ್ತು ಮೋತಾ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳನ್ನು ತರಬಹುದು ಎಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಹಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದರೂ ಇಂಥಾದ್ದು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬಿಟ್ಟರೇ ಮೇಲು ಎಂದು ನನಗೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಆ ವಿಷಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಇದೆಯೇ, ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳಿ. ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಹೊರತು ನಾನು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಆ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಮಾದಯ್ಯನವರು.—ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಇಷ್ಟೆ. ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದರ ಪರಿಣಾಮ ಹೇಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಕ್ಕುಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳ ಸಮಿತಿಗೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಒಬ್ಬರು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಂದ ಸೂಚನೆ ಬಂತು. ಅದು ಸಾಧುವಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕ. ಹಕ್ಕುಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳ ಸೂಚನೆ ಏನೆಂಬುದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅಂಥಾ ಸೂಚನೆ ಯಾವುದೂ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಮಾದಯ್ಯನವರು.—ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಏಳುತ್ತದೆ. ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದ ವಿಚಾರಗಳು ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲದ ಹಾಗೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದ್ದು ನಮಗೆ.....

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಲ್. ಜೋಯಿಸರು.—Unseen hand ಅಂತ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಬಹಳವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ವಿಷಯ ಏನೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಮಾದಯ್ಯನವರು.—ಹಿಂದೆ ಯಾರೋ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದರು, ಅಷ್ಟೆ! consent and consultation ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಯಾವುದು ಕಾಣಿಸಿಟ್ಟು ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಲ್ಪಟ್ಟದೆಯೋ ಆ ವಿಚಾರವಲ್ಲ. ಒಳ ಒಳಗೇ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾ ವಿಚಾರಗಳು ಎಂದು ಹಿಂದೆ ಯಾರೋ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇರುವುದು ಇತರ ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯಗಳಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಗಳಿಗೂ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುವ ವಿಚಾರ, ಬಹಳ ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದ ವಿಚಾರ. ಜನಾಬ್ ಇಮಾರವರು ಕಾಣಿಸಿಟ್ಟು ಪಕ್ಷ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನ ಆರೋಪ ಮತ್ತು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚಿಸಬಹುದೆಂದು ನಿರ್ವಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ, ಇಂಥಾ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಿಗೆ ಗಮನ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು, ಬಾಕಿ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಿಗೆ ಗಮನ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅದು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಗಮನಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ವಿಷಯ ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈಗಲೇ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತಲೂ ಸಂದರ್ಭಬದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

(Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—*Stood up to speak.*)

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is the Hon'ble Member going straight to the merits of the question?

* Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Chitaldrug District General).—I am submitting to the House that it is not a matter which could be discussed. Just to say that I have got up.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I think that is over. There is no use in discussing that. We shall go to the merits of the question.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Is it the ruling of the Chair that it could be discussed?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not a ruling. The House is not unanimous about it.

Sri H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA.—I go further and say that the Chair has asked the opinion of the Hon'ble Members.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Am I to speak regarding the discussion of the subject or on merits of the case?

Mr. SPEAKER.—On the merits of the case.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Then this is a matter of academic importance and not directly arising out of the motion tabled by the Hon'ble Member Janab Mahomed Imam. Matters of academic importance can only be discussed if there are definite and clear issues before the House. Here the Hon'ble Member Janab Mahomed Imam made three distinctions

about the recommendation, the feasibility of it and the nature of the recommendation discussed and so on. I say that these matters could arise and would arise only when we have a committee to formulate Standing Orders and Rules for the Legislative Assembly in future. We have now taken the past Legislative Rules and Standing Orders as our guidance.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Again the Hon'ble Member is saying something not relevant.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—No, Sir. I am going into the matter directly. Here there are three points. He says "a recommendation emanating on account of consultation by the Government of India." I shall take article 3 of the Constitution of India. There it is definitely laid down that the Legislature shall be consulted for altering the areas or the boundaries or the names of existing states. There the Cabinet has no right to make a recommendation without consulting the Legislature. That is perfectly clear. Therefore I say that wherever the Constitution lays down that consultation should be done in a definite particular way, the Cabinet has no other alternative but to follow it. Therefore the kind of recommendation depends upon the Constitution itself. So the Constitution has to be looked into before deciding. There also they ask for the recommendation, the opinion in which case whether the Government is bound to consult the Legislature or not is the question.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Not consulting the Legislature; whether the Legislature can give an opinion upon the recommendation made by the Government.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—It arises next. Whether they are bound to consult is the first question. If they are not bound to consult, then the question whether we have got a right to debate on that point comes directly or indirectly. If they are not bound to consult and if in their discretion they may consult, that is one thing; if in their discretion it is brought to the notice of the House that

it would endanger the safety of the State or the safety of India in which case they make a recommendation in the interests of the country itself. There are occasions. Supposing it is a time of war. Supposing there is a situation where it would not be safe to bring to the notice of the House certain matter.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is a different matter. If they say that in the interests of the country or in the interests of the State it is not advisable to refer it to the Assembly, then certainly we will agree, but whether the House has got the right to discuss that or not.....

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—That is why I say that that right can only arise out of the decision or the Standing Orders or the Constitution. Whether the Constitution gives us right on certain matters, is the point. For example, the Government of India in its general supervisory capacity has a right to supervise any State or Province or the administration of any State or Province and in that capacity the Central Government asks the Government of Mysore to give its opinion on certain matters. On those matters we have a right to question the advisability or otherwise of the Government of Mysore making certain recommendations or giving certain opinion because it is not a constitutional matter. It is a matter where the Central Government in the interests of Mysore as well as of the Centre itself asks something and they make a recommendation. When they make a recommendation it is made in the interests of the State, but if the Ministry feels that it is in the interests of the State, the Legislature might feel that it is not in the interests of the State. So the House has a right to bring such things to notice, discuss those things, decide upon and either pass a vote of confidence, or discuss and leave it. The effect of such a recommendation on a responsible Ministry will be such that the Ministry may be set right. Therefore, it is necessary that on matters where the recommendations emanated not on account of a constitutional binding,

but on account of certain consultations made by the Central Government and the Ministry makes such recommendations, the House has a right and the Ministry cannot say that the House has no such right. That is my opinion so far as matters arising out of day-to-day administration are concerned. I call it "day-to-day administration" because it is not always the Constitution that rules; it is the necessity, the need and certain other urgent considerations that matter in this respect. Therefore, the Ministry cannot say that the House has no right. It is the privilege of the House to bring a motion or a cut motion and discuss, criticise or take such decision as it deems necessary. But let us take a matter where there is the constitutional aspect as in the recent discussions. There the Constitution does not lay down that the Ministry or the local Legislature or the local Government need be consulted at all. And there they ask an opinion. As though they might ask any individual in the Mysore State, they might ask the Ministry in the Mysore State and take a decision. There it is a matter of confidential nature for their own purpose. They will have to take a decision independently of any opinion furnished. Where the Constitution does not at all lay down, any special procedure it is an independent power vested in the President to act as he likes and for his benefit or for his personal information he gets some information or gets a recommendation. That stands on a different footing. So I submit we have no right to debate upon it because it infringes on the privilege of the President who has passed an order, and who is not before this House to answer. That is the point to be taken into consideration. We are indirectly criticising the action of a person who is not before the House, who cannot directly answer. That is a point which we will have to take into consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Not the action of the President, but the advice given by the Ministry.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Whether he took the advice or acted

independently of that advice, whether this advice moved him to take a certain course of action or independently of this matter, he took certain decision. Though we are criticising our Ministry for having given certain advice, that might indirectly affect the prestige or the power of the President. It might spread a feeling in the country for the condemnation of the Ministry for having given such an advice and he might be indirectly condemned. He is not here to answer, nor can we after getting his explanation put it here.

Therefore, on matters where he is not bound to consult and where he is only to take opinion as he likes; then the Constitution might not have provided for consultation. Under such circumstances, their opinion is as good as not having taken it into consideration. Therefore, on such matters this House cannot have any right to debate. That is my opinion, Sir.

And there is a third part, where Constitution itself lays down that the Ministry should be consulted. In such cases, it should be a convention, and consultation in such matters is almost asking the opinion of the State or the Legislature as well. Under certain circumstances, instead of asking the Legislature, they might ask the Ministry. But in effect it means, when there is the word 'consultation' that the opinion of that State comprising of Members of that Assembly, is the opinion which, on behalf of that House, they will have given. Therefore, all such matters, I may say.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—If it is an urgent matter, and if the Government takes some decision in the matter, can the House discuss that or not?

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—They should have a right to send their opinion, but with this confidence, that the House will support them. Their opinion should be such as they should be confident that the House will support them later. If they take a decision on which the House may not support, the mistake would be theirs and they have to face the criticism.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is quite evident.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—I may submit, under such circumstances the House should have a right to debate upon such opinions that the Government of Mysore might furnish, because the Central Government consults; otherwise, it is a different thing. I have already given my opinion. If the Central Government consults, it means, it consults the representatives of the people. In other words, it consults the Cabinet which is the representative of the House. Let them give their opinion on urgent matters. They must be responsible for such opinions; they must be able to convince the House about the correctness of that opinion. If it is not correct, the House should be in a position

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is the Government as such, competent to give such an opinion?

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—No. If the Central Government consults constitutionally, it can be provided on behalf of the State. If the Central Government takes a decision on the report or the recommendations that they make, because of the consulting nature prescribed that they shall be consulted or may be consulted and so on, in such case, when the Ministry takes a decision, it takes a decision with the consciousness that they should be able to convince the House about the correctness of their recommendation. If the House later on or if any Member later on feels that he has a right to discuss the correctness, he might bring a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Whether the Member has got a right or not is the question that we are discussing.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—If they feel that the recommendation is incorrect, then the House has a right to discuss or to take such decision on it as it deems fit. That is my opinion so far as the second aspect of this is concerned.

The third point is, where it is an administrative order and the Government of Mysore takes a decision, then, we have a right to debate upon and to say that they are correct or wrong. So, it is only in the case of

the first type where they are not bound to consult and there is no definite provision laid down and still they consult and the Government of Mysore gives its opinion, the position is different. There, the House, I submit, has no right to question.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is the implication of Responsible Ministry?

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Responsible Ministry, because responsibility is laid on their head either by the Constitution or by Administrative order. Here, the Constitution lays down definitely

Mr. SPEAKER.—The responsibility is there on account of the Constitution.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—The responsibility is not on their head; the responsibility is on the head of the President or the Prime Minister, whoever constitutionally passed certain orders. The President, under article 376, decides certain issues. To help him, supposing he had consulted the Advocate-General and gave a decision?

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is a different matter.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—You cannot criticise the Advocate-General saying that the Advocate-General had no right to give such an opinion or the opinion given by him was incorrect. That would be the position, Sir. Here, the Ministry might have given some opinion on which the President was not bound to take decision. It is something like a private letter being written and opinion furnished thereon. In all such matters, I submit, we have no right. It is only on matters where the Constitution lays down or in cases where executive orders are passed on account of the recommendation made by our Government, that the House must have a right to discuss the correctness by bringing a motion, or to decide upon the correctness or otherwise of their recommendation. This is my opinion on all these three matters.

* **Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.**—Mr. Speaker, Sir, when the Leader of the House raised this point of order, as he himself has made it very clear, it was

not with the intention of avoiding discussion but with a view to have a correct precedent laid down on the floor of this House that discussion has been raised. He has himself made it clear and all Hon'ble Members will bear with me when I say that I followed his speech very correctly. The point is this, Sir. The limitations imposed upon the power of the House so far as discussion on matters of administration is concerned are very few, and even with regard to the limitations imposed, they are subject to certain other articles in the Constitution. For example, I take article 211. Article 211 says that we cannot discuss matters relating to the conduct of a High Court Judge. But, at the same time, it is governed by article 124 which says, that a High Court Judge should be removed by the President from his office on an address presented by the House of Legislature wherein the question with regard to his misbehaviour or incapacity will be discussed.

Sri K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—Parliament.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—Even here. That applies to States also.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS.—No, no.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—It does; otherwise how can a Judge of the High Court of Mysore be removed?

Sri K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—What is the article?

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—Article 124. It is applicable to the States also. What I say is this. There may be difference of opinion. After all, it is a question of interpretation. So far as I am concerned, I am of the view that this House shall have as large a power as possible to discuss all matters of administration and I entirely agree with the view expressed by the Leader of the Opposition that this House has got power to discuss matters relating to the recommendations made either *suo moto* or on request, by the Government of Mysore to the States Ministry or the President. Therefore, we have ample powers and I do not want that the

powers of this House should be curtailed to any extent with regard to this matter and I crave a ruling in that direction from the Chair.

Sri G. VEERAPPA (Chitaldrug District—General).—Sir, this raises a very important legal as well as constitutional issue. There seems to be a necessity for clarification with regard to the constitutional meaning of 'advice' and 'recommendation.' I suppose, advice will be rendered by a Responsible Government and the Governor in a Province or Rajpramukh in the State will act on the advice of the Ministry who will be responsible to the Legislature. But, in this case, it is not an advice tendered by the Ministry either to the Rajpramukh or any other authority. Here, in this case, the opinion was sought as a sort of a report and they have sent a recommendation which is in the nature of a report, which they were not bound to send.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Have you got in your mind this particular instance?

Sri G. VEERAPPA.—I am speaking on a constitutional matter, on a general matter, because, I am trying to convince that there is a difference between the word 'recommendation' and the word 'advice'. I am glad that the Leader of the Opposition has only used the word 'recommendation'. So, my submission is, if it is an advice tendered by the Ministry either to the Rajpramukh or an authority which is bound to render an advice and any action is taken on that advice, certainly it was a matter for discussion, because the Ministry of Mysore is responsible to this House. But, in this case, they were not bound to tender any advice. Whether the Government of India or the President called for an opinion or report, or our Government sent a report *suo moto*, we do not know. We do not know whether this Government were asked to send a recommendation or whether they took the initiative to refer the matter to the President to enable him to take action in the matter. In this case it is purely a recommendation. As some Hon'ble Members said, this is a matter of a confidential nature:

Suppose, in the Parliament of India they raised a question that the action of the President was not correct; perhaps, the matter is a pertinent one there. But, so far as we are concerned, we have nothing to do with that matter. It is the President who takes action for the promotion or removal of a Judge. I do not agree with the view expressed by Sri T. Subramanya, because we have no powers to discuss with regard to the appointment of the High Court Judge or his removal for misconduct. If there is a vote of censure or if the majority of the Members of the Parliament express that any Judge in any State must be removed, it is for them to decide what action they should take. We cannot make any recommendation. From 26th January 1950, we have no powers in the matter. So, my own view is, that this is a recommendation on which we cannot discuss and the point of order that has been raised is perfectly correct and more so because the matter itself is not before us. In view of the fact that the cut motion has been withdrawn, there is no point before us to discuss.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ರಂಗರಾಮಯ್ಯನವರು (ಮೈಸೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಶಾಸನ ವಿಧಾಯಕ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗಿ ನಾವು ಏನು ಮಾಡಿಕೂಡದು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ 28 ರಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ರೂಲು 28 ರಲ್ಲಿ

"The matter of every speech must be strictly relevant to the matter before the Assembly."

ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಯಾವ ವಿಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟುಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಚರ್ಚೆಯ ವಿಷಯಗಳಿರಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಕಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದು ನೆಗೆಟಿವ್ ಆನ್ವಯ. ಅದು ನಮಗೆ ಕೈ ಕನ್ನಡಿಯಂತಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಬಂದಿರುವ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಯಾವ ವಿಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಆ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ನೋಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ಗಳನ್ನೂ, ವಿಧಿಗಳನ್ನೂ ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅದು ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದಂಥಾದ್ದು. ಇದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಗಂಟೆ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿಬಿಟ್ಟು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಂದ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಅದನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಿನ್ಸಿಪಲ್ ಆಗಿ ಮುಂದೆ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಅಷ್ಟು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಶ್ರೀ ಸುಬ್ರಹ್ಮಣ್ಯರವರು ಎತ್ತಿರುವ ವಿಚಾರವು.....

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ಆ ವಿಚಾರ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ.

L, A.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ರಂಗರಾಮಯ್ಯನವರು.—ಎರಡನೆಯದು ಎಲ್ಲ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಕಷ್ಟ ಬರುವುದೆಂದರೆ ಕಣ್‌ಕರೆಂಟ್ ಜ್ಯೂರಿಸ್‌ಡಕ್ಷನ್—ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಮೆಂಟಿಗೂ, ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೂ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಗೂ ಇರುವ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಬಹಳವಾಗಿ ಮುಂದೆ ಏಳುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೊಡುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದ್ದೇ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಮತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಕೇಳದೆ ಅನೇಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಬಹುದು. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಅಕಸ್ಮಾತ್ತಾಗಿ ಬಹಳ ತ್ಯರ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅನಂತರವಾದರೂ ಈ ಸಭೆ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ಅಥವಾ ವಿರೋಧ ಸೂಚಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಕಡ್ಡಾಯವಾದ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದ್ದೇ ಇರಬೇಕು. ತಮ್ಮ ನೋಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ 73 ಮತ್ತು 162 ಇವೆರಡನ್ನೂ ನಮೂದಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಿ. 73ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎಗ್ಜಿಕ್ಯೂಟಿವ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಎಷ್ಟುಮಟ್ಟಿಗಿದೆ, ಯೂನಿಯನ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ನಮೂದಾಗಿವೆ :—

Article 73 (1) of the Constitution of India says:

"Subject to the provisions of this Constitution, the executive power of the Union shall extend—

- (a) to the matters with respect to which Parliament has power to make laws; and
- (b) to the exercise of such rights, authority and jurisdiction as are exercisable by the Government of India by virtue of any treaty or agreement;

Provided that the executive power referred to in sub-clause (a) shall not, save as expressly provided in this Constitution or in any law made by Parliament, extend in any State specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule to matters with respect to which the Legislature of the State has also power to make laws."

ಇಂತಹ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ, ಅವರಿಗೆ overriding ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ, ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ, ಅದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ, ಆ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ನಾವು ಏನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇನ್ನು ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದ 162ನೆಯ ಅರ್ಟಿಕಲ್ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಇದೇ ರೀತಿ ಇದೆ.

Article 162 of the Constitution refers to the extent of executive power of State. It is as follows.—

"Subject to the provisions of this Constitution, the executive power of a State shall extend to the matters with respect to which the Legislature of the State has power to make laws:

Provided that in any matter with respect to which the Legislature of a State and Parliament have power to make laws, the executive power of the State shall be subject to, and limited by, the executive power expressly conferred by this Constitution or by any law made by Parliament upon the Union or authorities thereof."

ಇಂತಹ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಮಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದ್ದೇ ಇದೆ. ಇಂತಹ ವಿಷಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಏನಾದರೂ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಅವರು ಬದಲಾಯಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅಥವಾ ಅವರ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೇರುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ 'ನೋಟ್' ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿದೆ. ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ವಿಷಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು consult ಮಾಡಬೇಕೋ ಅಂತಹ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಚೀಫ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದ್ದೇ ಇದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದ್ದೇ ಇದೆ. ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ overriding ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಚೀಫ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು, ಆದರೆ ಆಪ್ತರು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ್ದು. ಇಷ್ಟು ಚೀಫ್ಗೆ ಬಂದದ್ದು ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಜಡ್ಜರ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾಡಿದ ಶಿಫಾರಸಿನ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ನಾವು ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೆ ಎಂಬುದು. ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ, ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಶಿಫಾರಸು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕಡ್ಡಾಯವಾಗಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದ ಅರ್ಚಿಕರನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಂತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. 376ನೆಯ ಅರ್ಚಿಕರನ್ನೂ ಹೊಸ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಸಂಸದಾನಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಜಡ್ಜರುಗಳನ್ನು ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ವಿಚಾರವಿದೆ. ಆದರಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ವಿಶದೀಕರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೈ ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರಾಗಿರುವವರು ತಾವು ಆ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬೇರೆಡೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಡದೇ ಯಿರುವ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಥವರನ್ನು ಅದೇ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಜಡ್ಜಿಗಳಾಗಿ ನೇಮಕವಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಅವರು ಅವರ ಕೆಲಸ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಬಹುದು. ಇನ್ನು 217ನೆಯ ಅರ್ಚಿಕರನ್ನೂ ಈ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಕಂಡ ಮೂರು ಷರತ್ತುಗಳಿವೆ :

"217. (1) Every Judge of a High Court shall be appointed by the President by warrant under his hand and seal after consultation with the Chief Justice of India, the Governor of the State, and in the case of appointment of a Judge other than the Chief Justice, the Chief Justice of the High Court, and shall hold office until he attains the age of sixty years :

Provided that—

- (a) a Judge may, by writing under his hand addressed to the President, resign his office;
- (b) a Judge may be removed from his office by the President in the manner provided in clause (4) of article 124 for the removal of a Judge of the Supreme Court;
- (c) the office of a Judge shall be vacated by his being appointed by the President to be a Judge of the Supreme Court or by his being transferred by the President to any other High Court within the territory of India."

ನುಪ್ರಿಯ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ಚೀಫ್ ಜಸ್ಟಿಸ್‌ರವರನ್ನು ಗವರ್ನರನ್ನೂ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಪ್ರೆಸಿಡೆಂಟ್‌ರವರು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸದಾನಿ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಜಡ್ಜರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ಚೀಫ್ ಜಸ್ಟಿಸ್‌ರವರು ಮತ್ತು ರಾಜಪ್ರಭುಗಳ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಕೇಳಿ

ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೇ ಬಡಬೇಕೆ ಎಂಬುದು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿಲ್ಲದೇಯಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಒಂದುವೇಳೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಅಪ್ಪೇಲನು ಗಮನಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಚೀಫ್‌ಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೂ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಚನ್ನ ಬಸಪ್ಪನವರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಬರಬಹುದಾದ ಇಂತಹ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಏಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿರಬೇಕು, ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ consult ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಒಂದು ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASA.—Sir, on a point of clarification; I never said so.

Sri M. GOVINDA REDDY:—Sir, the matters that have been under discussion in this House have been of supreme importance to us and to constitutionalists. It has been made out by some of the speakers on the analogy of constitutional precedents in democratic countries that a Government which is responsible to the Legislature shall also be answerable to it for all its actions. That has been in substance the principle on which this question is being discussed. Well, Sir, I must submit that our position in the new set-up is very unprecedented one. The constitutional analogy that has been taken from democratic countries does not apply to the Indian Constitution at this present juncture for this reason.

Let us examine the British Constitution. In the British Constitution, the Parliament has got every right to question the Government's actions and the Government there is answerable for their actions. But it is a unitary government. It is not a federal government. There is only one government. There is only one executive and it is answerable to only one House. That is the position there. But that analogy does not apply here. In the United States of America, the position is different. Although it has a federal structure, there is no responsible government in the sense we mean here. The President is responsible to the Congress and the Senate, because he is elected. He is an elected officer. But the President in practice has got powers, which both the

Congress and the Senate have delegated. There although it is a federal structure the powers of the Union and the powers of the State are clearly demarcated. Moreover that was a constitutional arrangement which was arrived at under different circumstances. There the States were in the beginning of their polity and came to an agreement. Therefore whatever the rights the States and the Centre have got and were given, they were freshly conceived and there was no precedent or history behind it. That was the case with Australia and Canada also. But, here I want to make a distinction. The distinction is this. We did not begin with the position that the United States of America began with. Here there were already Governments functioning. They had certain powers. The Centre now integrated the States and so a new constitution arose. In the act of integration the Centre reserved some powers to itself and also determined the powers of the units. That is the new position which is unprecedented according to me. Therefore, we must view the relations between the executive here and the executive in the Centre, the powers of this legislature and our relations with the executive here from that point of view. The accepted principle does not apply here for this very reason that here an executive which is discharging a function does at the same time much more than an executive that is discharging in the federal units of either the United States of America, Canada or Australia.

Just to elucidate the same point—here there are four parties the relations *inter se* of which we have to consider. The first is the President of the Union. The second is the Executive of the State. The third is the Legislature of this State and the fourth is the Government of the State. Now in the Indian Constitution the powers of these units have been assigned, their places are assigned and their powers are specified. The head of the executive is the Rajpramukh. His place, powers and functions have been defined and the relation which he has with the

Union is also defined. He has his relation with the President who is the head of the executive at the Centre. According to the Constitution, the Ministry gets into the picture only to the extent that it has to furnish information that is required by the State executive. I am pointing out the relevant article :

“ The Governor or the Head of the State (Rajpramukh) shall exercise his executive power either directly or through officers.”

That is one thing which brings the executive in relation to the State. The duties of the Chief Minister, and his place are specified as also of the Ministers. Article 167 lays upon the Ministers the duty of furnishing information required by the Rajpramukh. My point is to show that the Ministry has a definite place in the Constitution. Therefore it is the executive of the State, *i.e.*, the Rajpramukh, is the constitutional authority whom the President may consult and who has an obligation and a duty to the President of the Union. There is also a position which is quite unique in the Indian Constitution and that is, apart from the President who is the executive of the Centre and apart from the Rajpramukh, there are relations *inter se* between the States Ministry on the one hand and the Ministry of the States on the other. Now, with regard to the obligation that this Ministry owes to this House we have to approach from one point of view and it is this. The matters with which this State is concerned and over which this Legislature has powers are matters which have been specified in the State List and to a certain extent in the Concurrent List. This House has power to discuss only matters which come under these two lists—fully in the State List and to a certain extent, as limited by the Constitution itself, in the Concurrent List. As far as those matters are concerned, our Rajpramukh is the sole determining authority and this is a responsibility which the Rajpramukh has to bear. The Ministry may tender advice or make a recommendation. That distinction has very correctly been drawn by the

Hon'ble Leader of the House. The question of advice comes, where a duty is cast on this Ministry in advising the Rajpramukh on the action which he has to take with regard to the powers of the State. As far as that advice is concerned, I hold that the Ministry is responsible to this House and this House also can question any act of the Ministry in that particular sphere as far as the advice of the Ministry to the Rajpramukh is concerned in matters which comes under the State List and to a certain extent which do not override the constitutional provisions under the Concurrent List. But if it comes to a question of the Ministry's recommendations, the position according to me is different. The recommendation of the Ministry does not cast an obligation or duty upon the Ministry. Moreover, the recommendations do not relate to matters upon which this House has authority. Advice given on matters over which this House has authority can be questioned here. Upon matters which do not belong to the sphere of this House, which do not come within its scope, although the Ministry is really functioning, I doubt whether this House has got powers to question. This House can function properly and constitutionally only within the orbit which has been assigned to it by the Constitution. That orbit is a matter which comes under the State List and to some extent under the Concurrent List. The appointment of a Judge of the High Court is not a matter which comes under the State List. It is a matter which comes under the Union List. My doubt is whether this House is competent to discuss a recommendation which does not come under the purview of this House, which does not pertain to the State List, or the Concurrent List. It is a different thing whether the Ministry is obliged to do it or not. My point is whether this House has jurisdiction to get into a question which is done by the Ministry in something which does not pertain to the scope of this House. That is the point which we have to consider. As I said, by the uniqueness of the Indian Constitution, the Ministry has to discharge

some functions which do not properly come within the purview of the State List or the Concurrent List. In the act of integration, in this transition period, it is well that the Centre is consulting the Ministers and the Ministers also are offering their opinions or submitting their recommendations. Does the very fact that the Ministry has submitted the recommendation bring the Ministry's action into question by the House? That is a very weighty matter. In my opinion this House will not be within its powers to question the recommendation of the Ministry regarding any matter which does not belong to the purview of this House. But a question may arise, if the Ministry does perform an act which although it does not relate to matters concerned to this House, reflects upon the State and therefore in so far as it brings reflection upon the State, whether this House is not competent to question that act. That is a pertinent point in my opinion which should be considered. According to me the Ministry's recommendations may bring credit to the State or may bring discredit to the State. With regard to a recommendation which does not belong to the purview of this House if the Ministry does something which does not bring credit to this House then this House has power and that power is not raising a discussion on the topic of the recommendation concerned because that will be ruled out; it will not be within the scope of this Legislature according to the Constitution; it does not come under the State List; it does not come under the Concurrent List. But this House has a way open for it and that is only to table a no-confidence motion against the Ministry and then in that form question the act of the Ministry. Otherwise it cannot question. Whether this Ministry has power to submit a recommendation or not is a different matter. But we cannot question the power of the Ministry in submitting a recommendation in a matter which does not come within the purview of this House. That is my point.

Sri K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—
Till what time are we sitting?

ಲಭ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ.—ಎಷ್ಟು ಹೊತ್ತಿನವರೆಗೆ ಸಭೆ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಬಹುದು ?

SOME HON'BLE MEMBERS.—The time is up.

Janab **SYED ABDUR RAHMAN** (Chikmagalur *cum* Shimoga—Muslim).—Sir, this is certainly a matter of very great constitutional importance. Janab Mohamed Imam has very ably dealt with this point. My friend Sri Govinda Reddy who has just preceded me has also made a thorough survey of the entire constitutional position with regard to the point in question. My view with regard to the whole matter is this. The Government of Mysore stands committed to a particular position and that particular position is that it has supported the recommendation made by the Chief Justice.

Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—That point does not arise at all.

Janab **SYED ABDUR RAHMAN.**—Because the point is whether the recommendation made by the present Government could be discussed by this House; whether this House has got the right to discuss that particular aspect of the case is the point under discussion.

Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—No, no.

Janab **SYED ABDUR RAHMAN.**—My friend Sri Govinda Reddy pointed out that in the present state of transition and in the act of integration, Government have done a certain act. Not all acts are questioned. Certainly there is justification for the act in which the Government of India have taken an initiative. For example, federal subjects—Central subjects that we have transferred to the Centre. The initiative has come from the Government of India. We do not at all question the propriety or the authority of this Government in that matter because they are guided by the Government of India policy. But in a matter such as this with which the House is just at present concerned, in a matter of public importance in which the representatives of the people have a say with regard to the matter, whether that right should be conceded to them or not is this point; that is just the thing which is engaging the attention

of the House. Whether this House of representatives of the people of the Mysore State having at its head a Government responsible to the Legislature, a Government which is responsible to the people, can discuss a matter of such public importance, whether the members of this House having regard to what is being spoken or what is being written outside the House, have the right or not to discuss that particular subject, is all the point we are concerned with. The Hon'ble Leader of the House and the other Hon'ble Ministers who are there, who have been for such a long time fighting for responsible Government and who are themselves the custodians of the rights and the privileges of the people of the State and you, Sir, who is the true guardian and custodian of the rights and privileges of this House, are sure to safeguard the rights of this House. Whether we are entitled to discuss a matter of that kind, is the point under consideration. We are not at all questioning the authority of the Government with regard to that matter. It is within the Government's discretion. They might have thought fit to do a certain thing or not to do a certain thing. I do not want to enter into that sphere at all. All that we are concerned with is whether this House can discuss a matter in which the Government of Mysore has actively associated itself in some shape or other with regard to the subject that has been transferred to the Centre. For example, appointment or retirement of a Judge of the High Court. With regard to the extension of his office or determining the term of his office, this is a matter in which our Government has done an overt act; and had it not been for the interpellation that was tabled by Srimathi Durgabai, one of the Members of Parliament, probably we would have not known what had transpired. Because certain information has come to light, because a statement had been made on the floor of the Parliament by Sardar Patel that the Government of Mysore has also equally strongly supported the recommendation made by the Chief Justice, this House, I feel,

has a right to consider that aspect, to express its own opinion with regard to that matter and I think this House must be allowed that right. That is all. I am not entering into the merits of the case at all. The point raised by Janab Mahomed Imam for discussion is proper and quite in order.

Sri K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—

Mr. Speaker, I must perforce be brief in my remarks in view of the limitation of time. At the very outset I want to say for the benefit of the Hon'ble Member Janab Mahomed Imam that I am very reluctant to dig the grave of any one, much less so to dig the grave of the powers and the privileges of our Legislature. I have already said that I am as anxious as he is to maintain the privileges and powers of this House. The question that has now arisen is one of great constitutional importance. The pros and cons of the point raised by me have been sufficiently debated upon and I feel there is not much for me to say at the end of the debate. One point has, however, been made, namely, that the general assumption should be that in the absence of the specific limitation, we have got the power to debate on any matter whatsoever. That has been the position taken up by the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition and I want to just make a remark or two in that connection. The correct constitutional position would be as follows. So far as the Centre is concerned, the sphere of the executive authority of the Centre has been specifically laid down in article 73 of the Constitution. So far as the States are concerned, the executive sphere of the State is prescribed by article 162 of the Constitution. I submit that the executive authority of either the Centre or the State is specifically and clearly laid down by these two articles which I have referred to and I may venture to say that those very articles lay down the limitations also. Art. 73 says:

"(1) Subject to the provisions of this Constitution, the executive power of the Union shall extend—

- (a) to the matters with respect to which Parliament has power to make laws; and
- (b) to the exercise of such rights, authority and jurisdiction as are exercisable by

the Government of India by virtue of any treaty or agreement:

Provided that the executive power referred to in sub-clause (a) shall not, save as expressly provided in this Constitution or in any law made by Parliament, extend in any State specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule to matters with respect to which the Legislature of the State has also power to make laws."

That is the limitation laid down. Article 162 also is worded in a similar manner.

"Subject to the provisions of this Constitution, the executive power of a State shall extend to the matters with respect to which the Legislature of the State has power to make laws:

"Provided that in any matter with respect to which the Legislature of a State and Parliament have power to make laws, the executive power of the State shall be subject to, and limited by, the executive power expressly conferred by this Constitution or by any law made by Parliament upon the Union or authorities thereof."

In other words.....

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—That is only in relation to the powers of the Legislature. Likewise, is the power of the Legislature restricted in relation to the power of the executive?

Sri K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—

The sphere of the executive power is coterminous with the sphere of the legislative power of either the Centre or the State. In other words, the sphere of the executive power is limited by the provisos which I have just now quoted in view of the concurrent list that is now put in the Constitution. So far as the concurrent list is concerned, the Parliament has power to make certain laws with regard to certain matters. The State also has got power to make laws with regard to the very subjects and so it is, two provisos have been put in to the substantive articles 73 and 162 keeping in mind the powers that have been vested by the Constitution as a result of the concurrent list.

So, it is only that limitation that has been specifically imposed and no other limitation. Therefore I may say that substantively the powers vested in either the Centre or the State taking the State Legislature also into account, are those powers which have been specifically conferred on them. To say, unless we have a specific limitation we have got wide sphere and we are in a position to discuss any subject or any

opic on the floor of this House I am afraid, constitutionally speaking, would be too much. That would not be the correct position. So, Sir, I would like to say that the field of debate in a State Legislature is quite extensive with the powers of legislation and the same thing applies to the Centre as well. So far as that point is concerned, I am very sure in my mind, that is the constitutional position.

Then, the next question on which you wanted our opinion was this, with regard to these matters on which the Government of India has taken any decision and before taking such a decision if they followed a certain procedure which involves the Ministry of any State concerned, I have got to say this. So far as those subjects regarding which the consent of the State concerned is necessary, there is specific obligation and responsibility attached to the Ministry of the particular State which gives its consent and the Legislature will certainly be well within its right to debate upon matters like that. The second category of cases relate to the proviso only for mere consultation. With regard to such cases also where it is obligatory in the terms of the specific provisions of the Constitution for the Government of India to consult any State concerned, there also I am prepared to stress a point and say, the opinion given by the State Government may become the subject-matter of debate on the floor of the Legislature. But, where it is the responsibility definitely of the Government of India to take any particular decision or to pass any order and where it is not obligatory on the part of the Central Government to consult the State or to obtain the opinion of the Ministry of any State, there, I submit, we will not be in order to discuss such matters on the floor of this House. The proper forum where such matters have got to be discussed would be the Indian Parliament and not the State Legislature. The crux of the matter is like this. If a matter has got to be discussed in a State Legislature, it must be in a position to fix the responsibility of the Ministry definitely and squarely.

Otherwise, it will be a sort of profitless discussion. And in cases where the responsibility of the Ministry cannot be fixed, in cases where they cannot criticise the action of the Ministry and take it to the stage of moving a motion of no-confidence on the Ministry, I submit that they cannot be matters for discussion on the floor of the House. So far as this particular instance is concerned, I have already referred to it. I also took up the example of the appointment of High Court Judges. Under the Indian Constitution vacancies of High Court Judges have got to be filled in by an order of the President. If any Hon'ble Member of this House wants to raise a discussion on the recommendation or the advice given by the Ministry here with regard to that matter, then I am afraid we will be going beyond the scope of the Constitution and the powers contemplated in the Constitution.

Janab J. MAHOMED IMAM.—But nothing in the provisions of the Constitution prevents our discussing such matters.

Sri K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—I do not want to take up much time of the House at this stage. My contention is this: any advice or recommendation that might have been given by any Ministry of any State, unless it is related to the exercise of their responsibility in accordance with specific powers vested in them by the Constitution, cannot be a fit matter for discussion on the floor of the State Legislature.

I have got only to refer to one aspect and that relates to the ruling given by the Hon'ble Speaker of the Indian Parliament when the adjournment motion on the escape of Mir Laik Ali came up for admission. When I raised the point of order I said that the Hon'ble Speaker of the Indian Parliament had laid down that that was not an appropriate matter for discussion on the floor of the Indian Parliament, because law and order was a provincial subject and as such the motion could not be allowed. I want to modify that statement that I made. The Hon'ble Speaker of the Indian Parliament ruled that that subject could not be an appropriate

matter for being discussed as an adjournment motion on the floor of the Indian Parliament. But he said that it could be discussed as an ordinary matter perhaps in the Indian Parliament. But there is this aspect which we cannot forget at the same time. Why did he say so? Because under article 371, the Central Government is definitely clothed with authority of general control over the States concerned. If that article is not there, I am quite sure that the Hon'ble Speaker of the Indian Parliament would have ruled that the matter being a State matter could not be discussed on the floor of the House. I am not quite sure what would be the ruling of the Hon'ble Speaker of the Indian Parliament if any question relating to law and order of a similar nature pertaining to Part A States, such as Bombay or Madras arises in the Indian Parliament. Because we happen to be in Part B States in relation to which general control has been vested in the Indian Government by a specific section of the Indian Constitution, the Hon'ble Speaker of the Indian Parliament gave the ruling that he did. So that, it is a fundamental position that I took, namely, that matters relating solely to the sphere of the State administration cannot be debated upon on the floor of the Indian Parliament and *vice versa*. That is the general position I wanted to take. I do not think I need add anything further at this stage. I do not know if the Hon'ble Speaker will give a ruling on the matter in this session or will require time to consider the various aspects raised. Whatever it is, I would like the Hon'ble Chair to give its most careful consideration to this important matter and give a ruling, because the ruling that would be given on this occasion.....

Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—If necessary a ruling may be given.

Sri K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—If the Hon'ble Chair does not think it necessary to lay down a general ruling but feels that it will give a ruling as and when questions arise, it is for the Chair to consider and say so.

Sri H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA.—Having referred the matter, we expect a ruling.

Sri K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—I only want to say one thing, *viz.*, that the ruling that may be given must not only maintain the privileges and powers of the House unimpaired but also keep in mind the constitutional and technical position, the two considerations being balanced. I have every hope that the ruling will be one that will be of use not only to us but also to the other State Legislatures.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಕ್ರಿಯಾರೋಪದ ಮೇಲೆ ರೂಲಿಂಗನ್ನು ಈ ಕೂಡಲೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ನಾನು ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮನಸ್ಸು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ. ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದು ಮುಂದೆ ತಾವು ಅಪೇಕ್ಷಿಸಿದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು.

Sri H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA.—Why this modification?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಇದು ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ ಪ್ರಮೇಯವಿಲ್ಲ; ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಮುಂದೆ ಆ ವಿಚಾರ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Prorogation of the Session.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ವೆಂಕಟಸ್ವಾಮಯ್ಯರು ಈಗ ಈ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಕ್ತಾಯಮಾಡುವ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ನೋಟೀಫಿಕೇಷನ್ ಬಂದಿದೆ, ಅದು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇದೆ.

"In pursuance of sub-clause (b) of Clause 2 of article 174 of the Constitution of India, I JAYACHAMARAJA WADIYAR, Maharaja of Mysore, hereby prorogue the Session of the Mysore Legislative Assembly at the conclusion of its business on Tuesday, 4th April 1950."

The House now stands prorogued.

Vote of Thanks.

Mashir-ul-Mulk J. MAHOMED IMAM (Chitaldrug cum Tumkur—Muslim).—We are all thankful to you, Sir, for the able manner in which you have conducted the deliberations of this House.

The Assembly was prorogued at Thirty-two Minutes past One of the Clock.

CORRIGENDA.

In the Legislative Assembly Debates—Budget Session, 1950.

In pages Nos.—

- 2 left column, last but one line, *for* "member" *read* "a member"
- 3 left column, line 51, add "was concerned" at the end.
- 29 right column, line 56, insert 'is' between 'it' and 'a'.
- 33 right column, line 30, *for* 'over him' *read* 'him over'.
- 42 left column, line 9, *for* "ಯಾವರಿಗೆ" *read* "ಯಾವರಿಗೆ"
- 49 left column, line 49, *for* "ಶಾಂತಿ" *read* "ಶಾಂತಿ".
- 53 right column, line 53, insert 'is' between 'Mysore' and 'the'
- 58 left column, lines 10—14, omit the small para.
- 78 right column, line 11, *for* "little" *read* 'a little'.
- 78 right column, line 11, *for* 'effect' *read* 'result'.
- 78 right column, line 17, *for* 'variances' *read* 'variations'.
- 121 right column, line 33, delete 'that' between 'concerned' and 'it is'.
- 132 right column, line 4, *read* 'you' *for* 'You'.
- 133 left column, line 52, *read* 'ploughshares' *for* 'shares'.
- 134 left column, line 4 *read* "ಪಾಗರ" *for* "ಪಾದರ".
- 285 right column, line 36, delete 'and' after 'be'.
- 286 left column, lines 31, 34 and 44, *for* 'Kangeri' *read* 'Kengeri'.
- 335 left column, line 12, insert "is" between "retrenchment" and "effected".
- 345 left column, line 17, insert "to" between "relate" and "the".
- 345 left column, line 40, *read* "recognised" *for* "recognise"
- 391 right column, lines 4 and 5, *read* "Nobody" *for* "No body".
- 401 left column, line 16, *read* "in" *for* "n".
- 416 left column, line 14, *for* "Q. No. 162" *read* "Q. No. 152"
- 417 right column, line 16, *for* "wheat" *read* "wheat"
- 422 left column, line 2, *for* "ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿ. ದಾನಪ್ಪ" *read* "ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ರಂಗರಾಮಯ್ಯನವರು"
- 446 right column, line 45, insert the words "are saved" between "officer" and "but".
- 446 right column, line 46, *for* "services" *read* "series".
- 446 right column, line 46, *for* "sarved" *read* "saved".
- 446 right column, lines 47 and 48, omit the words "are saved".
- 455 left column, line 19, *for* "Coup" *read* "Coupe"
- 459 left column, line 7, *for* "Mr." *read* "Sri".
- 470 left column, line 55, *for* "weakening" *read* "weakens".
- 471 right column, line 8, *for* "of" *read* "if"
- 475 right column, line 26, *for* "with that" *read* "without"
- 477 right column, line 55, *for* "ಇಲಾಖೆಯಿಂದ" *read* "ಇರಾಜೆಯಿಂದ"
- 483 left column, line 10, *for* "Home" *read* "who"
- 483 left column, line 18, *for* "ಇತರರೇ" *read* "ಇಲ್ಲವೇ".
- 485 left column, line 12, *for* "ಸಿನ್ಹ" *read* "ಸಿನ್ಹಂ".
- 502 right column, line 14, after the word "the" omit "cut"
- 540 left column, line 23, *for* "Tere" *read* "There".
- 540 left column, line 35, remove dash after the word "ಕರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರು"
- 547 right column, line 23, *for* "Medicat" *read* "Medical"
- 547 right column, line 40, *for* "whe" *read* "when".
- 547 right column, line 47, add 'good' after 'is'.

In pages Nos.—

- 549 right column, line 20 for "ome" read "Home".
 555 left column, line 47, for "Siddaiya" read "H. Siddaiya"
 561 left column, line 1, for "There" read "Three"
 564 left column, line 3, for "get" read "got"
 568 left column, line 8, remove one "that"
 573 right column, line 21, insert "of" between "boys" and
 "different".
 617 right column, line 5, for "much" read "such"
 617 right column, line 42, for "dot" read "not"
 627 right column, line 35, insert the words "Sri H. C. Dasappa"
 in block letters.
 633 left column, line 26, add "any rate" after "at"
 634 left column, line 20, for "ಮುಖಗಾಗಿ" read "ಕೃಷಿಗಾಗಿ".
 637 right column, line 28, for "become" read "because".
 643 left column, line 34, for "fresh" read "the"
 653 left column, line 54, for "ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ" read "ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ"
 666 left column, between lines 36 and 37, add heading "Motion to
 consider".
 674 right column, line 1, for "ಒತ್ತಾಯಪಡೆಸುತ್ತ" read "ಒತ್ತಾಯ
 : ಪಡೆಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೆ"
 674 right column, line 52, for "ಟ್ರಾಪಿಂಗಿಗೆ" read "ಟ್ರಾಪಿಂಗಿಗೆ".
 684 left column, line 19, insert the figure "2" between "clauses"
 and "to 4".
 710 left column, line 54, add "of" between "entertainment" and
 "Guests".
 714 left column, line 18, for "improvable" read "improbable".
 738 left column, line 33, add "ಹೋಗುವುದನ್ನು" between "ನಟವರು" and
 "ಮಾತ್ರ".
 738 left column, line 34, delete "ಹೋಗುವುದನ್ನು"
 740 right column, line 17, for "ಚರನೆಮಾಡುವ" read "ರಚನೆಮಾಡುವ".
 748 left column, last line, for 'ess' read 'less'.
 756 right column, line 3, for 'Sri A' read 'Sri B'.
 757 left column, line 45, for "ಹಣವನ್ನೂ" read "ಹಣವನ್ನೂ"
 757 right column, line 47, for 'tleast his' read 'least this'.
 803 line 55, for 'toar' read 'tear'.
 821 right column, line 14, for 'te' read 'to'.
 821 right column, line 39, for 'i crease' read 'increase'.
 822 right column, line 9, for 'i xisting' read 'is existing'.
 862 left column, line 36, for "ಅದನ್ನು" read "ಅದನ್ನು".
 863 left column, line 15, for "ನೈತಿಕ" read "ನೈತಿಕಮಟ್ಟ".
 854 right column, line 1, for "ಅದನ್ನು ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಿ" read "ಹಾಗೆ ನೇಮಕ
 ಮಾಡಿ"
 866 right column, line 28, for "ಉದ್ಯಮದಾರನಿಗೆ" read "ಉದ್ಯಮದಾರನಿಗೆ"
 871 right column, line 21, for 'sep' read 'set'.
 880 left column, line 14, for "ಬಹುದೆಂಬ" read "ಬಹುದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು".
 881 left column, line 3, "ordergene rally" read "order generally".
 882 left column, line 47, for "Speake" read "Speaker"
 884 left column, line 4, delete "the position".
 885 right column, line 49, for "ಅಂತ" read "ಅಂತ".
 886 right column, line 20 for "SRI A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—"
 read "Sri A. Bhimappa Naik" and for 'Stood' read 'stood'